FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 143 27 July 1981

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

PRAVDA Carries Ustinov Article on Disarmament AA 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Polish, E. German Warships Arrive in Leningrad BB 1
General Yefimov Reviews Book on Warsaw Pact BB 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jul]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Burlatskiy, Gerasimov, Sobolev]
Crimea Meetings, Peace Appeal CC 1
Ottawa Conference CC 2
Euromissile Protests CC 4
Israeli Bombing of Lebanon CC 5
U.S.-PRC Ties CC 6

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Held Responsible for Israeli Aggression A 1
[Losev in OGONEK]
IZVESTIYA Views Moves To Reduce Controls on CIA [Nabatchikov, 17 Jul] A 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

MPR's Batmonh Views Independence Anniversary C 1
[IZVESTIYA 10 Jul]
Mongolia's Tsedenbal Arrives in USSR on Vacation C 4
U.S. 'Pressure' Increase Japan's Military Effort C 4
[Chugrov in IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]

SOUTH ASIA

AFP Cited on CIA's Activities in Afghanistan D 1
BAKHTAR Attack on U.S.-Pakistani Ties Noted D 1
[PRAVDA 20 Jul]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Artamonov Reviews Aid to Burma, Current Relations E 1
[IZVESTIYA 16 Jul]

EASTERN EUROPE

Hungary's Kadar Arrives in USSR for Holiday F 1
Soviet, CSSR Trade Ministers Discuss Cooperation F 1
[IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]
Supreme Soviet Delegation Leaves for GDR F 1
Yugoslavia Supports Supreme Soviet Appeal F 1
[PRAVDA 16 Jul]

WESTERN EUROPE

CPSU Delegation Departs for PCE Congress G 1
Patolichev Meets With French, Italian Officials G 1
Meeting With French Minister [IZVESTIYA 17 Jul] G 1
Talks on Trade With Italy [IZVESTIYA 18 Jul] G 1
PRAVDA Comments on Western Proposals for Cyprus [Miroshnik, 18 Jul] G 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Results of Iranian Presidential Elections Reported H 1
Moscow Persian Report H 1
Kuvaldin Comments on Arafat Press Conference H 1
NEDELYA Sees U.S. Quest for Mideast 'Diktat' H 2
[Koryavin, No 29]
U.S. Policy Called 'Two-Faced, Hypocritical, Cynical' H 4
Israeli Threats Following Cease-fire Noted H 4
Soviet Diplomat Warns Israel on Action in Lebanon H 5
[Samet in Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ 24 Jul]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Editorial Article Reviews Brezhnev Book [18 Jul] R 1

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

CSA's Guryev Issues Statement on 6-Month Figures S 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Admiral Gorshkov Congratulates Minesweeper Crew V 1
[Shirokov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jul]
Petrov Addresses Ground Forces Party Aktiv V 1
[Sladkov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jul]

PRAVDA CARRIES USTINOV ARTICLE ON DISARMAMENT

LD242152 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2100 GMT 24 Jul 81

["Article by Dmitriy Ustinov entitled 'Against the Arms Race and the Threat of War'"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 25 July, (TASS)--PRAVDA today publishes an article by Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense. The article says:

"With great creative enthusiasm the Soviet people are working on the implementation of the decisions of tne 26th CPSU Congress. Throughout the country a nationwide drive is on to implement the plans for the building of communism. At the same time the Soviet Union, together with all peace-loving forces, is waging a struggle for peace, against military danger, and for the prevention of a ruinous war. In the process it is overcoming fierce opposition from imperialism and other reactionary forces.

The loyalty of the Soviet Union to the great goals--peace, progress and creative work for the benefit of mankind--was graphically demonstrated at the fifth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which was held recently. The speech to the session by L.I. Brezhnev, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Appeal to the Parliaments and Peoples of the World, which was adopted by the supreme organ of legislative power in our country, have reaffirmed that our party and state are consistently working on the implementing the peace program for the eighties which was approved by the 26th CPSU Congress.

The Soviet Union is resolutely opposed to imperialism's course toward the exacerbation of the international situation and for the arms race. Our position is to ensure for all peoples security and the conditions for the successful solution of problems of their development, and the reduction of the burden of military spending. As a result of the implementation of the peace program drawn up by the Communist Party and the coordinated foreign-policy activity of the fraternal countries of socialism and at the cost of enormous efforts by the whole of progressive mankind, it proved possible in the seventies to channel international relations into the relaxation of tension and to commence restructuring them on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The fruits of detente have not been inconsiderable. Trust has increased between states and peoples. People started looking toward the future with greater hope. A whole series of important measures was implemented to improve interstate relations in Europe and to create greater stability in the world.

A major event of the past decade was constituted by the decisions of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which confirmed the inviolability of the post-war borders which had been established between states and which provided a solid base for cooperation in the political, economic and military fields and in the field of science and culture.

A constructive basis was laid for Soviet-American relations. The sides recognized that the preservation of peace and peaceful coexistence are equally necessary and advantageous both to the USSR and to the United States. On the principles of equality and equal security, respect for mutual interests and noninterference in one another's internal affairs, a number of important treaties and agreements were concluded, including those on preventing nuclear war, on measures in the sphere of limiting strategic offensive arms and on limiting antimissile defense systems. Soviet-American talks were started on the reduction of military activity in the Indian Ocean, on questions relating to the banning or limitation of many types of weapons, on the limitation of the arms trade and on other problems of disarmament. In 1979 the leaders of the USSR and the United States signed the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Weapons (SALT II).

However, at the turning point of the eighties there has been a radical change in the policy of the United States and a number of other NATO countries. The upper hand there was resumed by circles which orient themselves on force in international matters, which refuse to accept the changes conditioned by history which are taking place in the world, and which have set for themselves the objective of altering, in their favor and at any price, the balance of power in the world arena.

In May 1978 the NATO Council adopted a decision on a radical increase in military budgets and on a long-term program (lasting until 1995) of stepping up arms on the scale of the whole bloc. In December 1979 the United States with the aid of the FRG foisted upon their allies a plan of locating new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. Undertaking these steps, the United States of course realized that it was violating the agreement reached with the Soviet Union concerning the observance of the principle of equality and uniform security in mutual relations and that it is deliberately aiming at worsening relations with the USSR.

This action violated the statements made by the U.S. President in 1979 in favor of observing parity between the USSR and the United States as well as respect for peace and the sovereignty of other states.

The United States openly declared its intentions to resort in its policy to the use of or to the threat of application of weapons including nuclear weapons. Whole areas of the world began to be shamelessly declared a sphere of 'vital interests' of the United States. The interventionist Rapid Deployment Force is being set up and American bases are being stepped up in the Indian Ocean, in many countries of the Near East as well as in other areas, while in Europe stocks of arms and combat equipment for dual-base forces [voyska dvoynogo bazirovaniya] are being increased. The ruling circles of Washington have decided to overturn all the positive elements in Soviet-American relations achieved during the seventies and to break down the approximate equality in the military sphere between the USSR and the United States.

On the other side of the Atlantic they have again started talking about the acceptability of a 'limited' nuclear war for Europe, and the possibility of inflicting a preemptive strike on military targets in the USSR in order to render it harmless. How should one react to such a surge of bellicosity? Can one seriously consider the possibility of some kind of limited nuclear war? After all, it is clear to everyone that the actions of an aggressor will inevitably and swiftly call forth a destructive retaliatory strike from the side which has been subjected to aggression. Only completely irresponsible people can claim that nuclear war can be waged in accordance with some prearranged rules, according to which nuclear missiles are to explode 'in a gentlemanly fashion' on specific targets alone, without hitting the population in the process.

However, to any person with the slightest knowledge of nuclear weapons it is utterly clear what casualties and destruction any use of them will cause. After all, it is well known that the consequences of the explosion of the two American nuclear bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki are being felt even to the present day and are causing the loss of human lives.

Without putting forward any positive initiatives the Reagan administration has taken a standpoint of unconcealed anti-Sovietism. At the same time it is grossly interfering in the affairs of other states and is high-handedly dictating its demands to them. Washington has launched a broad offensive against the national-liberation movements in Africa, Asia and particularly in Latin America, is giving every sort of support to antipopular regimes and is putting arms, equipment, military advisers and money at their disposal.

Where is such a course leading? What are the new U.S. leaders preparing for the world?

The ruling circles of the United States are bringing matters to a further intensification of international tension and an exacerbation of Soviet-American relations.

The United States has chosen anti-Sovietism, the suppression of national-liberation movements, destabilization of the situation in the socialist community countries and subversion of socialism all together as a system as the basis of its foreign policy course, developing a slanderous campaign around the 'Soviet military threat' myth. Reactionary military forces, with the encouragement of the American Government, are deliberately striving to sow distrust and fear toward the USSR and its policy and are openly declaring the Soviet Union to be the United States' chief enemy. Resorting to monstrous deception and massive disinformation they are alleging that the USSR is striving to seize others' territories, has a military budget exceeding its defense needs and is deploying 'offensive' weapons systems, which NATO 'is unable to counter with any equivalent thing' and so on.

All this is a crude distortion of the facts in order to deceive people and to mask their own aggressive plans. By this means the U.S. administration is hoping to complicate the relations between other countries and the Soviet Union. to bring about the changes it needs in the world alignment of forces and to justify the use of arms to crush the peoples' liberation struggle and to create crisis situations in various parts of the world. There are other aims too: It hopes to obtain new credits for weapons, to justify intensive militarization and to curtail the rights of working people within the country.

The United States is allying with the most reactionary forces in the world: The Pol Pot cutthroats in Kampuchea, dictatorial regimes in Latin America and the racists in Southern Africa. They are actively helping to build up the military potential of China, inciting Japan to join in the arms race and taking matters as far as knocking together an anti-Soviet military bloc in the Far East. At the same time the United States is encouraging Israeli aggression against the Arab states, shielding its criminal, piratical actions.

This whole course of the White House, which is dangerous for the cause of peace, is aimed at giving itself an excuse to react to possible conflicts occurring in any part of the world by means of military force. Not since the days of the cold war has the line of using force shown itself so plainly in U.S. policy.

'We must restore the high mobility of the armed services', Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger asserts, 'and react quickly to changing situations in any part of the world---we must strengthen our positions in the world by means of arms. Such ideas represent the principal source of the threat of war today. They can only be described as the advocacy of war and incitement by imperialist circles.

Washington's Atlantic partners and Japan are being increasingly drawn into its reckless policy which is pushing the world toward an intensification of the arms race and to war. In effect they (some deliberately, others involuntarily) are encouraging U.S. claims to world domination, playing into its hands in the arms race and taking the path which leads to an increased danger of war.

The present administration has stated that the attainment of U.S. military superiority over the Soviet Union is its foremost aim in the next few years. To this end military spending next year by the Department of Defense alone will increase by more than $40 billion and will reach $226 billion. Altogether during the next 5 years (to 1986) the United States intends to spend $1.5 trillion, that is almost as much as it has spent on the armed services in the last 12 years.

The question arises: Why does the United States need such enormous military expenditure? No state including the United States in peacetime, of course, needs such military expenditure if it is not pursuing aggressive aims.

The reply of Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger is clear in this respect: 'We will spend all that is needed,' he stated, 'to increase the military might of America and to obtain superiority over the Soviet Union.' The concepts of 'equivalence', 'parity' and other such terms, in his opinion have no meaning now since the United States must rearm. As justification of the military actions, the false thesis has been advanced that the Soviet Union, allegedly 'attained overall strategic superiority in the last quarter of 1980 or in the first quarter of 1981.' Parity between the United States and the USSR allegedly no longer exists, and the United States is now inferior to the USSR in this respect. For this reason, they say, America must urgently 'rearm.'

The question arises: How do C. Weinberger's statements about the United States 'trailing militarily' tie up with the final reports to Congress of the outgoing Carter administration to the effect that in the sphere of strategic armaments there is, in particular, an approximate equality between the USSR and the United States? What could have happened to this equality in the 6 months during which the new administration has been in office? Is it that it has been discovered that previously they did not know how to add in the United States, or that some unexpected facts have come to light which were previously not taken into account? No, the facts have remained the same, but the American approach to them has changed. Washington's policy has altered. The United States has no need to 'upgrade its arms,' since it does not lag behind the USSR. Something else is involved: The military-strategic equality which has become established between our countries is not to the liking of the bellicose leaders in the present administration because it hinders the aggressive U.S. intentions in the world arena and restricts its expansionist actions. That is why the principle of equality is being sacrificed for a stake on superiority.

Secretary of State A. Haig recently admitted the premeditated untruth of assertions about the United States 'lagging behind.' He stated that in the field of strategic nuclear forces the parity between our countries is being maintained, as before. Only in the future, in his words, might the USSR catch up with the United States and put it in a vulnerable situation. It is reasonable then to ask: Why is the American administration undermining the coming into force of the SALT II, which strengthens the equality in strategic weapons, restricts the quantity of nuclear weapon carriers of the sides to the level of 2,250 units, and places an obstacle before their further quantiative and qualitative growth?

They are begging for one answer: The United States is not interested in understandings on the restrictions of strategic weapons. While they confess to their expedience in words, they come out against them in deeds. Instead of searching for understanding, the Reagan government has taken an open course toward the forced stepping up of 'superior strength' in future talks with the USSR.

The construction of nuclear-powered missle submarines of the Ohio type is being rushed ahead. The MX, ICBM's, new strategic bombers, strategic cruise missiles based in the air, at sea and on the ground and Pershing II ballistic missiles are being developed. The shuttle space system is being tested for military purposes. The forces are being equipped with large quantities of new conventional weapons. There are plans to increase the number of men in the U.S. armed services by 250,000 by 1986.

According to C. Weinberger, the Pentagon is drafting a 'new military strategy.' It retains in full the ideas contained in the well-known Carter Directive No 59 which banks on so-called 'limited' nuclear war. Furthermore, it demands that the U.S. Armed Forces and the U.S. economy be ready to wage two large-scale, protracted 'non-nuclear wars'--in Europe and in the Near East--at any one time, and to take part in a small conflict in any other part of the world.

The task is set of 'settling dispute by the might of the U.S. armed services.' Is the White House really thinking seriously of reviving the 'cudgel policy' in the 1980's? The United States should realize the following: The world today is not as it was. It is not they alone who have force at their disposal. America's aspiration to attain military superiority over the USSR merely undermines stability in the world and makes the United States' own security more shaky.

Another aspect of the activities of the present administration also stands out. It is gradually undermining many treaties and agreements. For example, the head of the Pentagon has cast doubt on the treaty between the USSR and the United States on limiting the anti-ballistic missile systems. He said that the United States might demand a review of this treaty if the circumstances suited it.

Evidently, the agreement between the USSR and the United States on preventing nuclear war has also begun to hinder Washington's political course. How else can one regard, for example, statements to the effect that 'the United States will not stop short of using armed force, including nuclear weapons' in relations with the Soviet Union? Would responsible figures in the United States make such statements if they wanted to improve relations between our countries?

The Washington administration believes that SALT II is not advantageous to the United States. It should be carefully studied, so they say. This is a strange way of operating: First they say that the treaty is unacceptable and then they say it should be studied. In what way is it not advantageous to the United States? After all, when the highest level parties signed, it they stated that 'the treaty is a mutually acceptable balance of interests of both sides, based on the principle of equality and identical security.' After all, its foundations were laid down and drawn up under two republican administrations--those of Nixon and Ford. It was only revised under the Democratic administration.

Judging by the statement of the present leaders of the United States they find a shortcoming in the treaty in the fact that it was founded on the principle of equality and uniform security. It is precisely this alone that constitutes an obstacle to the treaty becoming valid. 'SALT II should be revised in favor of the United States' is the demand of the White House. One would like to recall in this connection the words of L.I. Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress: 'We shall not consent to an agreement which would give unilateral superiority to the United States. There must be no illusion on this score.'

Recently, the United States unilaterally refused to discuss [words indistinct] talks on issues concerning the Indian Ocean, the limitation of the sale and supply of conventional weapons and on a complete and general ban on the tests of nuclear weapons; through the fault of the United States negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe have been blocked by means of absurd juggling with figures concerning the numerical strength of the armed forces of the two sides which, by the way, are approximately equal: in the NATO countries--991,000 men and in the Warsaw Pact countries--979,000 men.

The objective of all these activities of the U.S. administration--apart from the achievement of military superiority over the USSR and other socialist countries--also lies in the endeavor to attempt, by means of an unprecedented arms race, to undermine their national economies. In Washington some people are already calculating how many economic programs can be wrecked in the USSR in this way and how much the provision of produce, medical assistance and so on, in socialist countries, will be reduced. However, times are different. The calculations of our foes are built on sand. Socialist countries have every potential for wrecking the plans of reaction aimed at the achievement of military superiority.

The present American administration is elevating to the rank of state policy interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states and the open attack against national liberation movements. The world public reacted with indignation to the U.S. statements about the decision to openly arm the interventionist gangs which are being sent into Afghanistan; to the admission by the State Department that the United States is supplying arms to UNITA, which is operating with the Republic of South Africa against sovereign Angola; to the armed intervention in the internal affairs of El Salvador; and to the CIA plot in Mozambique and Zambia. The U.S. decisions to cancel the ban on the sale to China of weapons and modern military technology, which is a step openly hostile to the USSR, at the same time creates a real threat to Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea and other countries of the Far East and Southeast Asia.

The United States, with the assistance of Israel, is pursuing a policy of violence, threats and terror in the Near East and is to all intents and purposes encouraging the latter's aggressive actions, in particular in Lebanon. At the same time it is attempting to obtain in some places by force and in some places by bribery new military bases--in Somalia, Oman, Kenya, Egypt and Pakistan--and is reaching an agreement on the stationing of American land and air forces in the Sinai Peninsula, virtually to occupy the Sinai under the guise of a 'truce observer.' According to the Pentagon's design, American forces in these areas will be the vanguard of a Rapid Deployment Force for invading the countries of the Near East and the Persian Gulf.

American imperialism's tentacles reach into all parts of the world. Everywhere, where at all possible, provocations and diversionary acts are being carried out, and there is an expansion of existing beachheads and bases, and the preparation of new ones directed against the socialist countries and the developing countries and the national-liberation movements.

One gets the impression that circles have come to power in Washington who are capable of gambling with the vital interests of mankind for the sake of their own narrow selfish goals. Under the banner of defending the 'free world', they are kindling conflicts in various parts of the world, whipping up the arms race and pursuing a line of destabilizing the sociopolitical situation which has existed in Europe since World War II.

This entails a direct threat to the security of the USSR and its allies. One example of this threat are the events in Poland where, along with the action of internal counter-revolutionary forces, one has poorly camouflaged interference by imperialism. Prominent figures and even the U.S. Senate are, by their statements, openly interfering in the country's internal affairs. A special group on Poland has been set up at the State Department. This group is, on the administration's instructions, working out proposals for maintaining 'controlled tension' in Poland.

Those who are implementing such measures, which are directed in essence against the socialist gains of Peoples' Poland, should remember that the Polish people will be able to resist them. They can also rely on their friends and allies.

These are only a few of the multitude of examples of the manifestation of belligerent course of the present administration. They testify to the fact that Washington, once again, as a decade ago, is trying to speak to the Soviet Union in the language of 'cold war.' At the same time, its disregard for agreements which were reached between our two countries in the field of arms restriction is demonstrated. A. Haig states: 'We are not very concerned about the understandings of 1972, although they were agreed by both sides.'

What, then, does the U.S. administration want to achieve in its mutual relations with the Soviet Union? To spend all the positive capital which it has accumulated? But the American leaders do not frighten us with that. The CPSU and our people are not timid.

The peace program for the eighties adopted by the 26th congress of the Leninist party envisages concrete proposals for reducing nuclear and conventional arms, eliminating seats of conflict and resolving contentious international problems peacefully. The Soviet proposals are centered on further steps to strengthen peace in Europe. This is understandable. The countries and peoples of Europe, which have borne the full brunt of two world wars, have a particular interest in seeing that the process of relaxing tension continues unswervingly. It should be clear to everyone that it is precisely in Europe where aggravation of the situation is especially dangerous. It is here that two military-political alliances, NATO and the Warsaw Pact and their major military groups, stand facing each other and that huge arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons are concentrated.

In the interests of strengthening European security, the USSR proposes to consider and to agree upon the further expansion both of the confidence measures themselves in the military field, and of the zone of application of such measures; that is, their expansion to the whole of the European part of the USSR on the condition of the corresponding counterstep on the part of the Western states.

In advancing these far-ranging proposals on confidence measures, the Soviet Union takes as a departure point the facts that they are fully in keeping with the stipulations of the Final Act, take into account the positions of the Western countries and are designed to correspond to the successful completion of the Madrid meeting and the convocation of a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe.

How does the West react to our proposals? It shows no interest in attaining and understanding and refrains from a businesslike discussion of that problem. In the communique of the May session of the NATO Council it was stated that the West supports the idea of extending the zones confidence-building measures 'up to the Urals,' but for its part does not propose any corresponding measure.

It wants the USSR to unilaterally include the European part of its territory in the zone to which confidence-building measures should apply, claiming that that is natural and as it should be, since what is involved is just the Continent of Europe. And in the United States they are attempting to distort our initiative, portraying it as a trap for the West and an attempt to drive a wedge between the European NATO countries and the United States.

Such an approach is devoid both of good will and elementary realism. Europe is not a purely continental geographical concept. Europe is an area of land, the nearby areas of seas and oceans and the relevant airspace. If the Western states are not prepared to give a concrete reply now, then they could give one late, say at the forthcoming conference on military detente and disarmament. The Soviet side states quite categorically: The first part of our proposal--the extension of confidence-building measures and of the zone of their application--is for us inseparably linked with the second part--corresponding steps in response by the NATO countries--and cannot be realized without them.

The proposal to establish a moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear missiles by NATO countries and the USSR is a major step of good will on the part of the Soviet Union. The constructive nature of our proposal is clear: It suspends the arms race; it brings in a ban on the deployment by both sides of new nuclear weapons and the replacement of existing ones by new ones. This in turn stabilizes the situation in Europe. It creates favorable conditions for holding talks. The proposal for a moratorium is based on the rough parity in medium-range nuclear weapons between NATO and the USSR which has existed in Europe for a number of years, in which both sides have about 1,000 carriers.

On the NATO side these carriers are U.S. aircraft carrying nuclear weapons--F-111's and F-4's--which are stationed at air bases in a number of West European countries. FB-111 medium bombers; aircraft bearing nuclear weapons--A-6's and A-7's--on board U.S. aircraft carriers, of which there are over 700 in all; and also land-based medium-range ballistic missiles, missile submarines and the bomber force of U.S. allies, of which there are about 300 in all. All these have a range, a radius of operation, of 1,000-4,500 km and are a real threat to Soviet territory.

The indicated NATO arms have repeatedly been modernized and continue to be improved. (In Britain improved Polaris A-3TK missiles aboard submarines are being introduced and Trident missiles in the future; in France land and sea-based missiles with a single-unit warhead will be replaced by missiles with seven warheads.) U.S. forward-based weapons are also being renewed.

The process of modernization is also being carried out in the USSR. However, in the course of renewal for over 10 years now we have not increased by a single unit the overall level of Soviet medium-range carriers in Europe. The quantity of missile launching installations is even being reduced, since with the appearance of each new missile in the USSR there is the simultaneous removal of one and sometimes two of the old ones, which are dismantled and not deployed in other areas.

The overall power of the nuclear charges of Soviet missiles is also being reduced. Meanwhile, it needs to be stated that at the present time NATO's medium-range arms can carry in a single launch (flight) one and a half times as many nuclear charges as the corresponding USSR weapons.

In the event of the deployment in Europe of approximately 600 more American medium-range nuclear missiles, NATO will obtain a superiority in carriers of over 50 percent. With regard to the nuclear charges in a launch (flight) NATO's advantage will increase even more. As a result the approximate equality in the nuclear arms of the sides in Europe will be considerably disrupted in favor of NATO.

There is another no less important aspect of the problem. The new American medium-range missiles are strategic weapons with regard to the Soviet Union. Indeed, the United States is well aware of this.

Guided by selfish interests, however, it does not tell its European NATO allies about the true plans for the use of its medium-range missiles which are scheduled to be deployed in Europe. While declaring officially that the new missiles are allegedly meant for the defense of Western European countries, Washington in actual fact is intending them for the inflicting of 'preventive' strikes on Soviet ICBM's and other vitally important installations situated in the western areas of the USSR. After all, the Pershing II missiles, which possess a range of 2,500 km and a high accuracy, could inflict strikes upon the Soviet Union's installations at which they are aimed just 5 or 6 minutes after their launch. This would substantially alter the strategic situation. The main plan of the United States is an attempt to lessen the force of a retaliatory strike against U.S. territory in the event of aggression against the USSR and is not concerned with the security of Europe.

Naturally, if the necessity arises, a due response will be given to all this. We have the possibilities to prevent the military superiority of the United States. As a result, the equilibrium will be maintained, but on a higher level. If this happens, however, the security of West Europe will not increase, but decline, and the West European countries themselves will become even more dependent on the Pentagon's nuclear strategy.

The point of a moratorium, as we understand it, is that the sides should cease the further buildup of the medium-range nuclear-missile weapons which are already located in Europe. As L.I. Brezhnev stated at the dinner in honor of W. Brandt, 'the USSR is prepared to cease deployment of its medium-range missiles in the European part of the country on the day that talks start on the gist of the matter. That is only, of course, if the United States tells us that it will also desist from building up its medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe during the talks.'

If the NATO countries refrain from deploying additional U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, the USSR is prepared to reduce the number of medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in its western regions from its present level. Even tomorrow we would be prepared to sit down at the negotiating table and observing the principle of equality and identical security, agree on the limitation--or still better the reduction, the considerable reduction--of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

The moratorium is not a precondition for starting talks. But if the sides accepted it, it would create better circumstances in which to halt the dangerous process of building up nuclear armaments on European soil.

World opinion has greeted with satisfaction our appeal for restraint in the field of strategic armaments and for a continuation of talks on limiting them while at the same time preserving everything positive which has been achieved to date in this field. According as we do exceptionally great importance to this whole problem, we proposed to the United States that we should agree to limit the deployment of new submarines, the modernization of existing ballistic missiles stationed on these submarines or the development of new ones, and limit of other weapons of whatever type.

What was the U.S. reply? Secretary of State Haig said at a press conference in Rome that he 'Sees no possibilities at all for resuming the SALT talks in the near future.' At the same time Washington strives to mislead people by trying to convince the world that this matter is being held up by an alleged reluctance on the part of the USSR to get on with significant reductions in strategic weapons.

However, this is not so. The USSR is prepared to accede to fundamental reductions in strategic armaments which are possessed by both sides; moreover, we agreed to such an approach as we were signing SALT II. However, in solving this problem, one has to take into account all the factors of the strategic situation as they exist today. On the part of the USSR there are no objections to the prolongation of SALT on the basis of equality and mutual security without delay.

The Soviet Union is in favor of strengthening international security in all regions of the world, including the Near and Middle East, the regions of the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf.

As a counterbalance to the attempts by the United States to exacerbate the situation in the Near East, the USSR proposes a return to collective attempts to solve the Near Eastern problem within the framework of a specially convened international conference.

It is also essential to stop the creation in the Indian Ocean and in the Persian Gulf of ever greater groups of U.S. naval and air forces, to remove the direct threat of war, which hangs over the countries of those regions. The problem of security here should be solved by means of the concluding of an international agreement, taking into account the legitimate interests and the observance of the rights of all states of the region.

Comrade L.I. Brezhnev stated his readiness to also consider the question of the presence of a Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan. For this, the undeclared war against Afghanistan must be completely stopped, and reliable guarantees of nonintervention must be given to it.

Showing its concern to maintain peace in such an important region as the Far East, the USSR is ready to come to an understanding with all countries concerned on the use of confidence-building measures, here, too, in the military field.

With the aim of improving the international situation and preventing the world from sliding into war, the Soviet Union has proposed the convening of a special session of the UN Security Council in which the leaders of the member states of the council would take part. It has called on the West to take part in a dialogue at all levels, including the highest one.

Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's positive attitude toward the proposal to turn northern Europe into a nuclear-free zone and the ideas he has put forward for turning the Mediterranean area into a zone of stable peace and cooperation are persuasive confirmation of our peaceful intentions.

The Soviet peace initiatives are specific. They are constructive. They do not include a single one which pursues one-sided advantage. They provide real opportunities for finding mutually acceptable solutions, based on equality and identical security of the sides.

On our side the way to positive changes is open. The following was stated at the 26th CPSU Congress: The USSR wants normal relations with the United States in the belief that for the interests of both our countries' peoples and of mankind as a whole there is simply no other sensible path. It is up to Washington.

If the leaders of the United States and the NATO countries reject the opportunities that exist to agree on real political and military detente, on an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and if they prefer the arms race and the path of risky military adventurism to negotiations and the creation of a base for mutual trust, they will be responsible to the peoples of their own countries and to all mankind.

Guided by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the Soviet state is purposefully and persistently pursuing a line for the strengthening of peace and the curbing of the arms race, and is trying to ensure the preservation and deepening of detente, in order that all the peoples of the world may be able to enjoy the fruits of peace and freely arrange their own lives. This is the general line of the Soviet Union in the sphere of foreign policy. Our peace-loving policy is supported by the socialist countries and by all of progressive humanity.

It has never been part of the USSR's intentions, and [words indistinct] state or group of states. Our strategic doctrine, as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev has declared, has an exclusively defensive orientation. And this is reflected in the USSR Constitution.

The essence of the Soviet military doctrine consists in the fact that, being led by the principles of the Leninist foreign policy of peace and international security, it is directed towards the protection of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries and towards the prevention of imperialist aggression. Preventive and predatory wars of any type or scale and conceptions of preemptive nuclear strikes are alien to the Soviet military doctrine.

At the same time, one cannot fail to take into account the arms race, which has been unleashed by the United States, the atmosphere of hostility which is being whipped up at the present time in the United States and in NATO in relation to our country, and the open threats and attempts to interfere in the affairs of the socialist countries. In this connection, it is essential to remind some figures overseas that the love of peace of the countries of socialism should not be taken as a weakness.

The experience of the Great Fatherland War is a convincing affirmation of this fact. The socialist countries possess all the essentials for reliably defending their peoples. The forces and might of the countries of the socialist community are sufficient to rebuff aggression, and no one will ever be able to force them to their knees.

'One could, however, hope,' Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "that those who determine the policy of America today will be able to see things in a more realistic way. The military-strategic balance which exists between the United States and the USSR, between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, objectively serves to preserve peace on our planet. We have never tried to achieve and are not trying to achieve military supremacy over the other side. This is not our policy. But we will not allow the creation of such supremacy over ourselves. Such attempts, as well as talks with us from a position of strength are absolutely hopeless.'"

POLISH, E. GERMAN WARSHIPS ARRIVE IN LENINGRAD

LD250304 Moscow in Polish to Poland 1700 GMT 24 Jul 81

[Text] The people's salute rolled across the Finnish Bay today in honor of a squardron of Polish and GDR warships which arrived in Leningrad on official friendship visits. They will take part in the events marking Soviet Navy Day. The fleets are led by Commander of the Polish Navy Adm Ludwik Janczyszyn and Chief of Staff of the GDR Navy Vice Adm Gustav Hesse. The guests were welcomed today at the pier by a guard of honor of the Soviet Navy. The commanders of the fleets also paid visits to officials and received visitors on board their ships.

In an inteview with a TASS correspondent, Adm Ludwik Janczyszyn stressed that it is a great honor for Polish sailors to take part in the Leningrad navy parade. Such visits have become a tradition and are proof of the strenghtening of our comradeship-in-arms which has stood the test of time, Adm Ludwik Janczyszyn said.

The fleets of the Polish and GDR Navies will spend 4 days in Leningrad. Their crews will go sightseeing in the city and acquaint themselves with the cultural life of the city on the Neva, meet with Soviet sailors and play host to Leningrad residents.

GENERAL YEFIMOV REVIEWS BOOK ON WARSAW PACT

PM241446 Moscow KRANAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jul 81 p 3

[Candidate of Military Sciences Lt Gen N. Yefimov book review: "Combat Alliance of Internationalists"]

[Text] The book by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof Maj Gen V. Samoylenko entitled "The Basis of the Combat Alliance" [Osnova Boyevogo Soyuza", Voyenizdat, 1981] is devoted to the scientific study of the problems of proletarian internationalism--an important factor in the strenghtening of the socialist community countries; economic and defense might and moral and political unity.

On the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology the author investigates the complex of proletarian internationalism's growing influence in strengthening the defense might of the socialist community countries and their armed forces. The study of the mechanism of this influence is a task of great theoretical and practical significance. Its scientific solution helps military cadres to understand more deeply the sources of strength and to distinguish better the basic difference between the Warsaw Pact countries' defensive military and political alliance and the aggressive NATO bloc and ensures greater purposefulness and effectiveness in training personnel of the Soviet Armed Forces and the socialist countries' fraternal armies in the spirit of proletarian and socialist internationalism.

Relying on a modern theoretical base and an objective analysis of the concrete experience of the fraternal countries' political, economic and defense cooperation, the author investigates through a comprehensive approach the dialectical connection between proletarian internationalism and the strengthening of the socialist community's defense capability. The book provides an extensive scientific analysis of the content of proletarian and socialist internationalism and examines the stages of its development. The growth in the role of proletarian and socialist internationalism, the author stresses, is the most important feature of social progress in our epoch.

The key problem of proletarian internationalism is the combination of the international and national interests of the working class, of proletarian internationalism and patriotism. Their dialectical interaction, as is convincingly revealed by the author in the work, is also manifested in the sphere of defending socialism's gains.

In the modern situation the unity of national and international tasks in CPSU military policy is expressed in the steady striving to strengthen the defensive Warsaw Treaty Organization which was once again stressed by our party's 26th congress and the recent congresses of the Marxist-Leninist parties of Bulgaria, the CSSR and the GDR. The whole course of historical development has proved, the author notes, that policy which goes against these principles and in which nationalist aspirations prevail in the final analysis harms the interests primarily of the country which pursues it.

After analyzing the principles and reality of proletarian internationalism from a position of Marxist-Leninist theory, the author consistently reveals the influence of socialist internationalism on the development and strengthening of economic potential and of the forming and strengthening of the moral and political factor as the basic component of the socialist community's defense might.

The book pays great attention to the analysis of the role of socialist internationalism in the formation and strengthening of the moral-political factor. Here the author comes to an important conclusion: The unity and cohesion of the socialist countries is constantly strengthening on a common political, economic and edeological basis, and the process is intensively under way of realizing the need for collective defense of the historic gains of socialism by the people's masses which, according to V.I. Lenin, "is of tremendous significance and ensures victory."

The socialist armies and the Joint Armed Forces are a subject of special concern for the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties of the Warsaw Pact countries. The author devotes the book's concluding chapter to them. It demonstrates convincingly the objective need to create a military-political union of the socialist community countries on Leninist principles and reveals the functions of the Warsaw Pact.

The ideas of proletarian internationalism and of cooperation among the socialist countries, including cooperation in the sphere of collective military defense of revolutionary gains, were further developed in the 26th CPSU Congress documents. "There are also special circumstances," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev stressed in his report to the party congress, "when friends need special help. It was like that in Vietnam, which fell victim to Beijing's barbarous aggression in 1979.... And this, comrades, is socialist internationalism in practice."

In revealing the basic problems of proletarian and socialist internationalism, the author criticizes the gnosiolodgical and theoretical bases of nationalism, revisionism and Maoism and exposes the falsifiers of the theory and practice of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties on questions of internationalism, the unity of the socialist community countries and the activity of the Warsaw Pact, which is of topical significance for the present moment.

It is known that the imperialists and their accomplices are systematically conducting hostile campaigns against the socialist countries. They blacken and distort everything which happens in these countries and their armies. For example, bourgeois and Beijing propagandists have stepped up their attempts to misrepresent the defense tasks of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces and to distort the international character of the defense of the socialist fatherland.

Incidentally, these questions could be more fully elucidated in the book. It would also be appropriate to expound on the general experience of the fraternal armies in the international education of personnel, of which our military reader knows comparatively little.

On the whole Maj Gen V. Samoylenko's book deserves a positive appraisal. It will be read with benefit by all who are interested in questions of an international nature relating to the defense of socialism's gains.

WEEKLY INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE

LD262100 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 26 Jul 81

["International Observers' Roundtable" program with international affairs journalist Fedor Mikhailovich Burlatskiy, APN political observer Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, and all-union radio commentator Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev]

[Text] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades, in the last few days the traditional meetings in the Crimea between Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and leaders of fraternal parties and states have begun.

Crimea Meetings, Peace Appeal

These meetings are of tremendous significance. Each one of them yields something new and useful, as Leonid Ilich Brezhnev noted when addressing the 26th CPSU Congress. Without the formalities of protocol and in a comradely atmosphere, the participants in the meetings discuss the prospects for the development of our relations, the main problems of world politics and map out the tasks for the future. During his meeting with Afghan leader Babrak Karmal, Comrade Brezhnev described the present international situation as having become considerably complicated in recent times because of the actions of imperialist circles, first and foremost the United States. At the meeting between Comrades Brezhnev and Husak it was stressed that the future of Europe depends on the degree to which the foundations of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems are consolidated and developed here, on the political will for peace and on the practical actions, primarily of the European nations themselves.

[Gerasimov] As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the safeguarding of peace has been, is and remains the priority of its foreign policy. The program of peace for the eighties, adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress, is directed toward this. The appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet to parliaments and peoples of the world confirmed this. Even a quarter of a century ago the supreme organ of authority in our country adopted an appeal to parliaments concerning disarmament, and since then the USSR Supreme Soviet has frequently issued parliamentary initiatives in order to improve the international climate on earth for the sake of a peaceful today and a peaceful tomorrow for all people. All this testifies to the systematic and principled nature of the Soviet state's foreign policy. We can note too that in recent years the peoples' struggle for peace and detente has also become more active. A military-strategic equilibrium has come into being. Thus, a little more than 1 month ago the USSR Supreme Soviet's appeal was adopted, and the response it has aroused among the international public has already been very extensive.

[Burlatskiy] Some weeks ago, as a member of a Soviet delegation, I had occasion to visit Japan. We met leaders of the Socialist Party of Japan, leaders of the Committee for the Development of Soviet-Japanese Cooperation, which was specially set up not so long ago, and with many other political and public figures, and they were unanimous about one thing: the appeal by the USSR Supreme Soviet, like the proposals and initiatives submitted by Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress, undoubtedly merit attention and support.

[Sobolev] Returning to the questions dealt with during the meetings in the Crimea, I should like to draw attention to the importance that was attached there to economic cooperation among the fraternal countries. Socialist economic integration is an important factor of their success.

As an example we may cite, say, the GDR. Just this week the results of the GDR's economic and social development for the first half of the year were published. From the first years of its existence the GDR has maintained close ties with other socialist countries. For instance, the 30th anniversary has just occurred of the day when the Ost combine, the flagship of the country's ferrous metallurgy industry, produced its first pig iron. This first smelt was obtained in collaboration with Soviet specialists and with Soviet iron ore.

And here is an example from our own times: An ES-1055 electronic computer, equal to the world's best models, has been dispatched from Dresden to the Kama motor vehicle works. This is already the 27th computer to be sent by the Dresden combine Robotron to the Soviet Union in the last 6 months.

Well, now about the general results of development of the GDR economy. Here are some data. Compared with the same period last year, industrial production rose by 5.5 percent. The national income increased by 5 percent. Labor productivity has risen by roughly the same proportion. At the same time there has been a reduction in the consumption of energy, raw material and other materials. Let us mention this figure: 230 million manhours have been saved in 6 months. All this has made it possible to increase sharply the payments from public funds and to raise the financial income of the population by 3.3 percent. There has been an expansion of retail trade, particularly in durable consumer goods, and 250,000 inhabitants of the GDR have improved their living conditions, and so forth.

Of course, as Comrade Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, we are far from the stage where we can paint a picture of the contemporary socialist world in nothing but festive colors. Complications also occur in the development of our countries. Well, what are the reasons for this, Fedor Mikhailovich?

[Burlatskiy] I believe that one of the reasons is that the socialist countries are currently experiencing a very important stage in their development: This is the stage of transition from less developed to more developed forms of socialism. This is not a simple transition. It is a transition from extensive to intensive ways of running the economy, a transition linked with the implementation of economic reforms, the implementation of transformations in the sphere of management of the economy and social processes, and thus growing difficulties are inevitable.

But there is another reason: Socialism and communism are not being built in a vacuum in our countries. We are dealing primarily with the repercussions of the economic crises taking place in the capitalist world on the economic development of the socialist countries. Of course, the socialist countries counter these processes, but they cannot entirely dissociate themselves from or ignore this influence.

[Sobolev] It should be said here that the problems that arise in collaboration among socialist countries are being jointly resolved by us. We seek ways of most correctly linking the interests of each of the fraternal countries with their common interests. Moreover, the situation in the socialist community as a whole--confident economic growth, full employment, the stability of prices of consumer goods--all this differs strikingly from what we can observe in the capitalist economy.

Ottawa Conference

At present a great deal is being written and said about this in the West in connection with the meeting of heads of state and government of the seven leading capitalist countries, which took place the other day. This, the seventh, meeting of the big seven, as they are called in the West, has special features. For instance, the meeting was held as far away as possible from the noise of the city and from journalists, 70 kilometers from Ottawa, in a luxurious although timbered hotel, the Chateau Montebello.

After the attempts on the life of the pope and President Reagan, as the American television company CBS points out, extraordinary measures were taken to ensure security. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, a picked detachment of police which had undergone a special course with the British paratroopers, were assisted by antiterrorist detachments which had come there from the countries of the seven. As they say, a fly could not get in there. Even the stream flowing in that area was checked by military skindivers, while directly above it--precisely, too, for considerations of security--army helicopters flew, bringing the conference participants to the hotel from the Uplands Air Force Base.

In such conditions of extreme precaution both well conceived and more comprehensive results should have been expected. Say, recipes for how to save the capitalist economy from the slump, inflation and unemployment. But, to tell the truth, it may be said that nobody expected this even before the start of the meeting. They were expecting something else, differences of opinion. Trudeau, the host who received the guests, even said that the choice of the remote venue for the meeting was explained by the fact that differences of view, to put it briefly, a fundamental divergence of approach, were anticipated. Those were his own words. And if we are to speak of the results, an article about them was mockingly entitled by the West German paper DIE WELT "In Harmonious Disunity," and the British paper THE DAILY MIRROR noted in an editorial that the leaders of the seven had politely agreed to disagree with each other.

[Gerasimov] I believe that there were, nevertheless, some hopes before Ottawa, people expected something. If the leaders meet, people can't help expecting some display of statesmanlike wisdom. They launched a sort of brainstorm on the economic disorders. They are very great: inflation and unemployment are worse than before, the slump is continuing, there are 17 million people unemployed in the countries that met in Ottawa and there are forecasts of 26 million next year. Of course, this is a very gloomy forecast.

It should be said that each participant in the Ottawa meeting was thinking first and foremost about himself. Egoism was the guiding principle. For instance, this was one of the important matters raised there: The United States has considerably raised the interest rate, maybe it would be clearer to say, it sharply raised the value of the dollar. If anyone wants to obtain a dollar loan, it can be obtained only at an exorbitant rate of interest: 20.5 percent per annum. This is an attempt to cure one's own economy at the expense of others. The dollar above all is what Reagan might well have said in Ottawa. Helmut Schmidt, the FRG chancellor, complained of the plunderous rates of interest. He said that American policy in this sphere has forced the German interest rate also to be raised to 15-16 percent, and this is the highest rate since the birth of Christ. French President Francois Mitterrand said that for France such an interest rate is equivalent to a third oil crisis. Helmut Schmidt warned that this could all lead to social upheavals in the West.

[Sobolev] An example of this is Britain where such upheavals have occurred.

[Gerasimov] Yes, but nevertheless it was only Margaret Thatcher who supported Reagan in this sphere. Nonetheless, although there was this strong criticism of this step by the American administration, Reagan did not promise to lower the rate. Maybe at the end of the year, but in general he was making no promises. And so to all intents and purposes the United States insisted in having its own way here.

[Sobolev] Well, maybe the final communique does enumerate the problems but it does not prompt solutions for them. It contains, for instance, words to the effect that a paramount task should be the struggle to curb inflation and lower the level of unemployment, and these problems should be resolved together. There is an allusion here to the United States where the administration considers that first one should combat inflation and there is also an allusion to France where the government believes that first one should combat unemployment. In any event, the next phrase in the same communique says that reducing inflation leads to an increase in unemployment. As you can see, there are no prescriptions. After all, the point is not that all are in agreement with combating these evils but how this is to be done. Nothing specific was decided in the economic sphere.

[Burlatskiy] I believe that more general processes are behind this. Capitalism is not able to cope with the scientific and technological revolution. On the one hand the scientific and technological revolution has certainly been promoting the colossal growth of productive forces in the capitalist world but in retribution this process has been having the most negative consequences in the social sphere.

Indeed, it is not fortuitous that serious experts are now speaking of an inevitable growth of unemployment to 26 million next year, and what the following years or the next decade will show is difficult to imagine. It is quite apparent that the growth of unemployment, the growth of inflation and the growth of contradictions between the supranational monopolies and between capitalist countries are the direct result of the fact that capitalism is unable to cope with the genie which it has let out of the bottle of the scientific and technological revolution. It is not fortuitous that the leading forces of the capitalist countries are raising the question of the need for serious alternatives.

[Gerasimov] In Ottawa there was a discussion also of the question of trade and economic links with the Soviet Union. There was discussion of the perennial imaginary constant in Western policy: the notorious Soviet threat. Referring to it, the United States demanded a hardening of trade policy. However, its partners and allies resisted this. Japanese Minister of International Trade and Industry Tanaka, for instance, told a press conference at the end of the Ottawa meeting that the excessive stressing of the Soviet threat is somewhat strange.

The United States again attempted to dissuade West Germany from the deal with the Soviet Union providing for the supply of gas to West Germany in exchange for pipes. West Germany considers that this deal accords with its economic interests, while the United States is untactfully, if not to say unpardonably, lecturing the Germans and demanding that they take part in an economic war that the United States would not be loathe to unleash against the Soviet Union. Chancellor Schmidt expressed his resolute opposition in Ottawa to consultations on questions of East-West trade.

However, the communique speaks precisely about these consultations which are negative in character, not so much about how to trade with the Soviet Union. Chancellor Schmidt probably was expressing not only his own personal opinion when he said concerning American pressure: A convoy of 15 ships--meaning the 15 member-contries of NATO--cannot with each change of captian follow a new course. However, an attempt at this was perceptible in Ottawa.

[Sobolev] We have already spoken today of the fact that the participants in the summit meeting near Ottawa were hidden away as far as possible from journalists and were carefully guarded. In particular they were hidden away and protected to safeguard them from disturbing demonstrations by the public of Canada and the other countries of the seven. These demonstrations there in Ottawa were called "The People's Summit Meetings." They involved scientists, politicians and trade union and religious figures. The debates, meetings and demonstrations expressed a powerful protest against attempts to emerge from the economic crisis at the expense of ordinary people. These people's summit meetings in Canada also had a political aspect. The demonstrators expressed their opposition to the aggressive U.S. policy and the deployment of new American nuclear missiles and urged a resumption of talks on limiting armaments.

Euromissile Protests

And it is not only in Canada that such demonstrations have been and are being held. As it was put by Borm, a prominent FRG politician and member of the Executive of the Free Democratic Party, the movement of resistance to NATO's plans is growing in West Germany like an avalanche. The Europeans must realize, Borm said, that their own interest in a policy of detente and disarmament is in fundamental contradiction with the present U.S. political course.

According to data in the Italian magazine (?L'ESPRESSO) this has been understood by at least 56 percent of Britons who have expressed opposition to the deployment of new American missiles. Sixty percent of the Netherlanders also expressed themselves in this spirit--that is, as unconditionally rejecting the missiles. American observers have now thought up a name which, one must say, has become enshrined in practice, namely, Hollanditis--the Netherlands disease. Its symptoms are defined by them as pacifism, neutralism, renouncing armaments, and so forth. It has been called the Netherlands disease because the Netherlands Government has still not made a decision on the installation in its territory of new American medium-range missiles, and powerful public and political forces are acting to have this decision again postponed or renounced altogether.

[Gerasimov] In my opinion the Netherlands disease is by no means a disease but the manifestation of healthy instincts and a striving for life.

[Sobolev] Yes. Indeed, one of the participants in the 1981 peace march very rightly said that the Netherlands disease should be called Netherlands medicine, a medicine against the madness of nuclear missile armaments. Incidentally, this march, after passing through Denmark, the FRG, and the Netherlands, has already crossed Belgium and ahead of it is France where on 6 August there will be a meeting.

[Gerasimov] The day of 6 August is indeed the 36th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima and the beginning of the nuclear age.

[Burlatskiy] Evidently it is a question not only of serious political differences, that is, differences over political decisions, among the West European countries, Japan and the United States, but of differences of interest. West Europe is definitely displaying interest in the development of economic cooperation with East Europe and with the Soviet Union, in exactly the same way that Japan too is objectively interested in this. It is for this reason that these countries also advocate the preservation of political detente, which is one of the most important prerequisites for economic cooperation. It is precisely for this reason that West Europe and to a greater or lesser extent the different countries of the region are displaying such an unyielding attitude with regard to the switch being made by the White House away from detente toward cold war.

Israeli Bombing of Lebanon

[Sobolev] Continuing the program, comrades, I would like to note that throughout the past week reports from the Near East occupied positions of prominence in the foreign mass news media. Israel's bandit actions against neighboring Lebanon assumed an unprecedented scale. Britain's THE FINANCIAL TIMES wrote that the barbarous nature of the latest Israeli attacks on Lebanon leads us to presuppose that a new chapter has been opened in the tragic history of that country.

Hundreds of people have been killed and thousands injured by the Israeli bombings. In its statement TASS made a proper assessment of Israeli and U.S. policy in the Near East. It has to be said that there are two aspects to the present events in that region. On the one hand you have a premediated act of state terrorism committed by Israel, as the French newspaper LE MONDE put it. On the other hand there has been a noticeable and manifest swing in world public opinion against Israel and its U.S. patrons. It was not for nothing that the self-same LE MONDE noted that the Camp David agreement, which is already on its last legs, could possibly have been the main political casualty of the raid on Beirut.

[Gerasimov] Israel says that the reason for its openly piratical actions was its wish to remove the PLO from the territory of Lebanon. The British weekly, THE OBSERVER, wrote recently that Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin has the tunnel vision of a former terrorist and that he is trying to solve political problems by military methods.

In this remark by the newspaper the word "former" is surely wrong. After all, Begin is still using those same tactics of terror at the present time. This making a fetish out of force in international politics is, by the way, impressing the present administration. They are also relying on this force. However, there is one thing which can be forecast with confidence: After the ruins in Beirut have been pulled down, after the hostilities die down, the PLO will still be there in the south of the country. So too will the Palestinian problem, which will have to be resolved.

Quite recently, about 10 days ago, I visited the Ar-Rashidiyah refugee camp near the ancient city of Tyre in south Lebanon. I was shown dwellings with their roofs either blown off or in a collapsed state. I saw the ruins of dwellings. All this was the aftermath of nighttime Israeli shelling from naval vessels and air raids which occur at any time. I was shown air raid shelters to which the inhabitants hurry when the shelling starts. But they don't always get there in time. And now I am again reading reports about air raids on this much suffering Ar-Rashidiyah camp. This is terror, of course.

The provocative strategem of setting the Lebanese and the Palestinians against each other is also visible in Begin's decision, about which he has spoken, not to henceforth spare the civilian population. U.S. policy on the Near East has indeed been one of the casualties of the Israeli raids on the Lebanon. (?In the spring) U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig tried to make the countries of the region agree on a strategic consensus, in other words, a unanimous standpoint, according to which the Soviet Union is declared to be the main threat to the Near East. But the U.S. bombs which fell on the streets of Beirut, on the suburb of Baghdad and on ancient Tyre from Israeli planes of U.S. manufacture obliterated the Haig thesis. They also underscored the antithesis. The threat to peace in the Near East stems from Israel, which the United States supports. So, it is plair for all to see. The Arabs are stressing that little Israel could not behave so impudently if it were not confident that it would get away with everything behind the shield of U.S. patronage.

[Burlatskiy] I would like to cite some figures which illustrate the buildup in U.S. military assistance to Israel. During 1981 the U.S. Government will give Israel loans and subsidies worth a total of $2,185,000,000. Well, we can't help noting that this buildup of U.S. military assistance is part of the overall pattern of the Reagan administration's policy. During the 6 months that it has been in power this administration has completely abandoned the policy of restricting arms sales which was promised by President Carter.

[Gerasimov] You gain the general impression that the sale of arms is becoming almost the main aim of U.S. foreign policy. Alexander Haig has been touring the world almost like a peddler. He has been to the Near East as well. He offered Saudi Arabia weapons. He traveled to Beijing, for example. He offered Beijing weapons.

U.S.-PRC Ties

The U.S. administration's decision to sell lethal weapons to China was made known at the same time as the decision [as heard] that a station to monitor missile tests carried out in the Soviet Union had been set up on Chinese territory. It is in itself a special topic, a special matter.

There is no doubt that these actions, which mark a new step in military cooperation between the United States and the PRC, are an open and unprecedented challenge to the Soviet Union. But it is a challenge not just to the Soviet Union but to the entire socialist community in view of their mutual defense obligations. And it is a challenge not just to the socialist community but to all powers on the Asian Continent for whom the rearming of China means an abrupt disturbance of the balance of forces that has developed.

What does this decision mean to the United States itself? This action marks a fundamental change in U.S. military and political strategy not just in Asia but throughout the world. For the first time in 31 years the United States is selling arms to a country with which it has twice been involved in military conflict, during the civil war when it armed and supported the Kuomintang, and during the Korean war. Furthermore, we are talking about a country which U.S. ruling circles certainly regard not as white but red or pinkish at the very least, in other words, Communist China toward which until recently U.S. ruling circles were showing at least as much ill-will as toward the other socialist countries.

In this way the United States has carried out almost the greatest anti-Soviet action since the war. Following the lengthy hesitations of the predecessors of the present administration, President Nixon and President Carter, the White House, with the forthrightness that is now typical of it, has decided to play the Chinese card to the full.

[Burlatskiy] As it happens, Zbigniew Brzezinski, who is the Chinese favorite, is currently visiting China. As you may remember, he was President Carter's national security adviser. While in Beijing he proudly declared that an extensive new coalition opposing the Soviets is being formed within the international community. In other words, we are witnessing an attempt to establish a global anti-Soviet alliance.

What do the latest decisions mean for China itself? They mean that the Chinese leaders have hammered the last nail, I would say, into the coffin on which are written the sacramental Maoist words about the struggle with U.S. imperialism. We remember how for 25 years the Chinese leaders depicted themselves as almost the most consistent fighters against imperialism, above all, the United States. They used this as a pretext to oppose detente and the policy of peaceful coexistence, which the Soviet Union defended. On the basis of these arguments they tried to win points in their relations with the developing countries and to mislead the international revolutionary movement. Not even the most ardant pro-Maoist elements have any illusions any more. The Beijing leaders have made their choice, a choice that is quite clear, for the time being anyway. They have betrayed the interests of the people's revolution in China. They have betrayed the interests of cooperation with the socialist countries, with the national liberation movement, with all revolutionary forces of the present time.

This also means that the Chinese leaders will have to sweep their socialism ever further under the mat and to exhibit their nationalism more openly. This means that they will have to humbly wait for sops from the United States in the form of military and economic aid.

But there is more than this involved. Let us look at the question from the viewpoint of China's role as a great power. By entering into agreement with the United States on arms purchases and the establishment of a U.S. base directed against the Soviet Union, China is really lowering itself to the position of Egypt, for example.

[Sobolev] Our program is approaching its end. In conclusion I would like to stress yet again that the alarming time which our world is experiencing at the moment requires an ever more vigorous mobilization of peace-loving public opinion. People of good will in different countries have faith in the success of their cause because a contemporary force as influential and powerful as the socialist community, including the Soviet Union, is on their side. The (?policy) of our country, as expressed in the documents of the 26th CPSU Congress, the speeches of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, and the USSR Supreme Soviet's appeal, which was adopted at his behest, is encountering growing support everywhere. Goodbye, comrades. Thank you for your attention. All the best.

U.S. HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR ISRAELI AGGRESSION

LD261222 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 26 Jul 81

["Full Text" of article by TASS General Director Sergey Losev published in OGONEK magazine on 25 July]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jul, TASS --The 17th of July entered the tragic history of the Arab east as a "bloody Friday": 300 people were killed on that day as a result of a barbaric bombing by Israeli aircraft of Beirut's densely populated quarters. More than 800 residents of the Lebanese capital and Palestinians were wounded.

On the same day, representatives of Israel, the Unites States and Egypt initialled in the cosy rooms of the U.S. Embassy in London an agreement on establishing the so-called multinational forces for the Sinai Penensula. Such a concidence can hardly be accidental. The agreement on the multinational force gives the green light to the escalation of U.S. military presence in the Sinai and is a continutation of the Camp David deal which left the Israeli aggressors free to stage large-scale terrorist actions against Arab countries, similar to the piratic raids on Baghdad and Beirut.

There is an unseen but close connection between the Israeli air raids on neighbouring Arab countries, which increase in their scale and ruthlessness, and the Reagan administration's attempts to galvanize the moribund Camp David process. It is no accident that the Israeli bombings became a kind of accompaniment to the Middle East trip in April by U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig and to the current "shuttle missions" by the U.S. President's special envoy Philip Habib. The U.S. President's National Security Adviser Richard Allen, revealing, in fact, the secret calculations of the initiators of the diplomacy of terror and blackmail, expressed the hope that the Israeli raids will exert influence on those Arab countries which stubbornly refuse to join the Camp David deal. Allen said in an interview with BUSINESS WEEK magazine that the United States hopes that Egypt's isolation among Arab countries will be broken, and others will understand the expediency of sitting down at the negotiating table (naturally, on the terms of the aggressor)!

The piratic raid on Beirut is a link in a long chain of Tel Aviv's crimes, with the ruling circles of the United States being their direct accomplice and, actually, inspirer. Israel used American-made F-16 and F-15 planes for the attacks on Beirut and Baghdad. The planes were manned by Israeli pilots trained by American instructors. American-made bombs are dropped on Arab soil.

The ostentatious suspension of the deliveries of few American planes to Tel Aviv changes nothing, in fact, billions of dollars and large amounts of up-to-date offensive weapons continue to flow uninterruptedly from the Potomac banks to Israel to support the aggression. In the past four years alone, according to the former U.S. under-secretary of state, George Ball, Washington's aid to the Israeli militarists amounted to more than 11 billion dollars. Ball pointed out that since Israel is under U.S. protection, the world is justly inclined to placing on the United States responsibility for Israel's aggressive acitons.

Israel's crisis-gripped economy, militarised to the maximum, would have collapsed long ago under the burden of military spending if not for the U.S. props. The point at issue is not whether Washington has effective levers to influence the Begin regime. The United States has, undoubtedly, such means but they are used not to contain but to encourage the aggression and expansionism of Israel's ruling Zionist circles. It was after the raid on Baghdad that the United States prevented the imposition against Israel of mandatory sanctions arising from Chapter 7 of the UN Charter. At the same time, the leaders of the Republican administration confirmed that they continue to regard Israel as the main strategic support and the most faithful U.S. ally in the oil-rich Middle East region.

Immediately after the establishment of the state of Israel, Begin directed an operation in which the population of the Arab village of Deir Yasin was exterminated; more than 250 inhabitants--men, women, old people and children--were massacred by his gang with a view to causing panic among the Arabs and forcing them to flee Palestine. Now, as head of government, Begin puts into use advanced combat planes which are lavishly supplied to this professional murderer and fanatic by his overseas patrons.

A conviction is becoming stronger in the Arab world that the Zionist aggression should be curbed at its source. The organizations grouped into the Palestinian Resistance Movement urged the heads of Arab states to stop oil and gas deliveries to the United States, withdraw Arab assets from American banks and expel from the region the White House's envoy Habib whose arrival in the Middle East was a prologue of a new devastating war against Arab peoples.

The deliberate provocation by Israel of the armed conflict in the Middle East, the sparks of which may spread far beyond the region, meets with condemnation throughout the world. The extremist methods of Begin and Co. evoke certain objections even within the so-called "liberal wing" of the Zionist movement. The former president of the World Zionist Organization, Nahum Goldman, points out in the weekly JEUNE AFRIQUE that only a new Geneva conference on the Middle East under the U.S. auspices may bring about a comprehensive peace settlement in the region. Goldman states that such a solution cannot be ensured within the framework of the Camp David accords. He recalls that the joint Soviet-American statement on the Middle East of October 2, 1977 provided for the convocation of such a conference. "Unfortunately, the position of Israel and the pro-Israeli lobby in Washington forced the U.S. administration to depart from the statement, and As-Sadat's visit to Jerusalem pushed the idea of convening the Geneva conference into the background."

Not war but only political settlement can ensure the national independent existence and development of all the states and peoples in the Middle East. But to approach the stage of political settlement, it is first of all necessary to curb the Israeli aggression and thwart the adventurous plans in the region of U.S. militaristic circles which shamelessly encourage their stooges to acts of international banditry.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS MOVES TO REDUCE CONTROLS ON CIA

PM241507 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Nabatchikov "International Notes": "The Moles Are Crawling Out of Their Holes"]

[Text] At the present time, the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE reports, the authorities are again urgently circulating through the Washington corridors a draft special presidential decree providing for a reform of the American special services' "code of conduct". If President Reagan signs it--and this could take place in the near future--the decree will gain the force of law.

To all appearances, the White House attaches particular importance to the new directives intended for the "cloak and dagger department." This is indicated in particular by the fact that the preparation of them was entrusted to a so-called "interagency commission" specially created for the purpose. (It is headed by leading staffers of the CIA, the FBI, the Pentagon and the National Security Agency.) Moreover, the draft's authors are now trying hard to hide its contents under a veil of strict secrecy.

Nonetheless, individual provisions of the document have filtered all the same into the press. They are all, in the opinion of the foreign press, subordinated to a single purpose: imparting a legal and legitimized nature to the CIA's subversive and terrorist activity. In this the present administration, it seems, intends to outdo its predecessors.

For several years now Washington has been taking intensive steps to widen the espionage department's powers. Brandishing militarist and anti-Soviet slogans, the U.S. ruling circles have lately been presenting the CIA with one handout after another.

For example the bill "on the oversight of intelligence" was ratified not so long ago in the American Senate. The bill rescinded the Hughes-Ryan Amendment, which obliged the CIA to conduct "secret operations" abroad only with the president's approval and after prior notification of a number of the congressional committees. And the number of committees to which the CIA is formally supposed to be accountable has been reduced from eight to two. The bill in effect officially cleared the way for the CIA to recruit journalists, scientists and religious figures to gather espionage information.

And now the next CIA indulgences are being prepared. One of them, as the New York TIMES points out, "limits oversight of intelligence organs' activity." Apart from that it is proposed to repeal the requirement that espionage information be collected by the use of "the least unceremonious methods." Official permission to spy on American citizens is also in the pipeline for CIA agents. To all appearances they will be permitted to conduct secret searches without judicial warrants in private apartments and official buildings, to plant paid informers in national public organizations; and many other freedoms have been granted.

Consequently it is evident that Washington is striving to completely untie the CIA's hands of new illegal actions and also to legalize the shameless persecution of those who dare to expose the CIA. On this score the draft of the new law also contains an appropriate directive providing for a considerable extension of the intelligence services' rights to combat the leaking of "secret information" and strict sanctions against such leaks. Overall, the new draft is tailored in such a way as to even further enhance the CIA's role in the future as a weapon to attack the civil rights and freedoms of ordinary Americans. The only peculiarity being that unconstitutional actions by the American special services will now be legitimized.

Washington's latest efforts, as President Reagan expressed it, "to breathe new life into American intelligence activity" pursue another aim as well: CIA subversive activity abroad. For instance, the fact that with the blessing of the White House the CIA has embarked on planning new subversive and terrorist operations in the spirit of the recent past proves this.

As the New York DAILY NEWS points out, the CIA has now been instructed to use the anti-Cuban emigre rabble entrenched in the United States for new terrorist actions against Cuba. It is planned to arm the remnants of the Pol Pot gangs operating against Kampuchea's legitimate government, to organize fresh attempts on the lives of the leaders of foreign countries and to directly supply weapons to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries. The CIA has already given both verbal and practical notice of the extension of the U.S. support for the antigovernment forces in Angola and for the racist South African regime, the Chilean dictators and the Salvadoran butchers.

The galvanization of the CIA, the New York DAILY NEWS writes, citing a highly placed representative of the Republican administration, "is on the direct instructions of President Reagan. He is also supported by Secretary of State Haig and Secretary of Defense Weinberger."

It is characteristic that all the subversive and terrorist actions being prepared or already being carried out by the U.S. special services, and also the draft new presidential decree itself are being presented as part of the efforts "aimed at a more efficient struggle against terrorism." It is clear that such a "struggle" is in fact merely new support for waging terror and violence both in the United States itself and beyond its borders. In strengthening the CIA's criminal activity on the hypocritical pretext of countering terrorism, Washington is in fact officially paving the way for the escalation of lawlessness, the suppression of national liberatin movements and crude interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

MPR'S BATMONH VIEWS INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

PM240842 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by J. Batmonh, member of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Mongolian People's Republic Council of Ministers: "Years Equal to Centuries"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar--It is 60 years since the working masses of feudal, colonial Mongolia, one of the most backward Asian countries, under the influence of the ideas of October, under the leadership of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] and with fraternal assistance from Soviet Russia, rid their native land of foreign interventionists, cast off the yoke of local oppressors and laid the foundation for the radical revolutionary rebirth of their motherland. This revolution, the first victorious anti-imperialist and antifeudal revolution in the East, established working people's power, ensured the country's national independence and the possibility of transition to socialism and raised aloft the torch of Lenin's ideas over the entire Asian Continent. Our country's working people are greeting this important jubilee as a great festival of the establishment of a new socialist life on the territory of ancient Mongolia, as a festival of fraternal friendship, international unity and cohesion with the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries.

One can say, without fear of exaggeration, that in terms of the scale of the transformations and their significance for the people's future each decade our society has lived through has been the equivalent of centuries. In a short period the country has stormed the heights of economic progress, of socialist democracy and of a new culture. Guided by the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, creatively applying it to the specific conditions and remaining constantly loyal to the banner of proletarian internationalism, the MPRP has led the country consistently from feudalism to socialism. The transformation of a once-backward, feudal Mongolia into a dynamically developing socialist state with a modern, multisectorial economy, flourishing culture and growing people's well-being, the 18th MPRP Congress pointed out, is the chief result of the party's activity and the Mongolian people's selfless labor.

When we look back over the ground we have covered we become more and more deeply convinced that the victory of the people's revolution in Mongolia and the successes in all spheres of life were guaranteed by the close alliance between the herdsmen's masses and the proletariat of Soviet Russia and by the all-round cooperation and fraternal friendship between the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] and the USSR initiated by V.I. Lenin and D. Sukhe-Bator. The Mongolian-Soviet agreement signed on 5 November 1921--the first equitable agreement in our country's history--was the model for a new, socialist type of international relations. The friendship between our peoples was forged in the joint struggle against the White Guards and Japanese militarists and it widened and strengthened in all areas of peaceful labor. A new stage in the history of our unbreakable alliance was initiated by the treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance signed by Comrades Yu. Tsedenbal and L.I. Brezhnev in January 1966 in Ulaanbaatar.

Relying on the masses' political and labor activeness and the selfless assistance of the Soviet Union and all the other fraternal countries, the MPRP implemented major transformations to make the country a modern agrarian-industrial state. Socialist ownership of the means of production and new production relations became the solid basis of our forward development. There were tangible changes in agriculture and in the rural workers' way of life. Today's herdsman is a literate, energetic and enterprising person engaged in modern, large-scale agricultural production.

Livestock raising accounts for three-fourths of our agricultural production Nearly 24 million head of livestock are grazing today on the Mongolian steppes. A lot of work is being done in the country to strengthen livestock raising's material and technical base, to expand fodder production and to irrigate pasture land. This very important sector has considerable reserves which will help to satisfy even more fully the population's food requirements and industrial and export needs.

During the years of people's power rural workers have mastered a new profession--they have become farmers. With great enthusiasm Mongolia has set about opening up virgin land and constructing new state farms and workers settlements on the steppes. A further 250,000-300,000 hectares of virgin land are to be opened up in the current 5-year plan. The 18th MPRP Congress decided to formulate a long-term comprehensive targeted program for developing agricultural production and improving its efficiency. It will envisage measures on the implementation of our strategic tasks of ensuring reliable supplies of food and raw materials for the country in tandem with the solution of social problems in the countryside.

Mongolia had virtually no industry at all 60 years ago. Today the country has hundreds of fuel and energy, mining, timber and wood-processing, light and food, metal working and construction materials industry enterprises. Industry accounts for 63 percent of the increase in the national income. Our working class, which already has its dynasties and glorious traditions, has grown stronger. Existing enterprises are being retooled and new production capacities are being commissioned. On the eve of the jubilee Soviet and Mongolian construction workers commissioned ahead of schedule the fourth and final phase of Erdenet, one of the world's biggest mining and enriching combines. In celebrating the great labor feat of the builders of Erdenet, we pay tribute to the planning and design organizations, supply enterprises, workers and technical engineering personnel from the Soviet Union who participate in planning and constructing the combine and the city.

Utilizing the advantages of the socialist planned economy, our party pays special attention to the simultaneous solution of economic and social tasks. Such industrial centers as Darhan, Choybalsan, Erdenet, Baga Nuur and new centers currently springing up in the Mongolian steppes are the living embodiment of our party's economic and social policy, the fruit of Mongolian-Soviet friendship and a triumph of proletarian internationalism. Following the tried and true path, the Mongolian people are gradually transforming the country from an agrarian-industrial country into an industrial-agrarian country.

Profound changes are taking place in society's social and spiritual life. A new person has emerged, a full-fledged master of the people's state, dedicated to the lofty ideals of socialism and actively participating in running the country. The recent elections to central and local organs of power are evidence of our society's genuine democraticism. Some 27 percent of the People's Great Hural deputies are workers, almost 29 percent are rural workers and around one-fourth are women. The elections demonstrated anew the unity of party and people and all working people's warm support for the MPRP's foreign and domestic policy and the large-scale creative program adopted at the 18th MPRP Congress.

The party congress decisions draw the attention of communists and all working people to the need to constantly improve work quality and social production efficiency, to make better use of reserves, to implement economy measures more consistently, to introduce leading experience, especially the experience of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries and improve forms and methods of management and planning.

A new culture is blossoming in the country and we are seeing the rapid development of modern science, which has achieved many things in various spheres of basic and applied research. The culmination of these successes was the flight by the first Mongolian cosmonaut as part of an international Soviet-Mongolian crew in the Soyuz-39 spacecraft.

Most important of all in socialist society is concern for man, for his all-round harmonious development, for the constant improvement of his living conditions. Over 40 percent of state budget expenditure, goes on sociocultural measures. We are consistently implementing housing construction, expanding consumer services and developing public health services. People are now living, on the average twice as long as they did before people's power.

Mongolian working people link all the successes with the MPRP's leading and directing activity, with fraternal Mongolian-Soviet friendship and with the support of all the socialist community countries. Each passing year and 5-year plan sees an increase in the scale and an improvement in the forms of cooperation between the Mongolian and Soviet peoples which plays a decisive part in accelerating socialist building in our land, in improving the people's material and cultural standard and in strengthening the country's defense capability. Joint enterprises, which have convincingly demonstrated their effectiveness and their promising future, play an important part in cooperation between our countries.

As an active member of the socialist community the MPR is expanding and deepening cooperation with all fraternal countries in accordance with the tenets and spirit of the comprehensive program of socialist economic integration. We attach paramount importance to further strengthening the socialist community and to strengthening its international positions, and we wholly and fully support the timely and important proposals made by L. I. Brezhnev in the Accountability Report at the 26th CPSU Congress on the need to supplement the coordination of our plans by coordinating economic policy as a whole, to bring together the structures of the economic mechanisms and further develop direct ties between ministries, associations and enterprises.

The 26th CPSU Congress, the 18th MPRP Congress and the congresses of a number of other fraternal parties convincingly demonstrated once again the unity and cohesion of our socialist community, inspired the working people to new accomplishments in building socialism and communism and injected a new dose of cheerfulness and optimism. The fraternal parties and governments of the socialist community countries display a balanced approach to the modern international situation which has been complicated as a result of the aggressive intrigues of the imperialist and hegemonist forces which unleashed the arms race. In these conditions the fraternal countries' cohesion and collaboration are more important than ever before.

The 18th MPRP Congress and the entire Mongolian public resolutely supported the peace initiatives put forward by L. I. Brezhnev, ardent fighter for peace, at the 26th CPSU Congress. Endeavoring to do all it can to promote the strengthening of peace and security, Mongolia proposed the elaboration and signing of a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states. "The peoples of our world have a sacred right to peace," Yu. Tsedenbal said at the 18th MPRP Congress. "This right must be reliably safeguarded."

The recent Mongolian People's Great Hural session expressed the will of our people when it adopted a statement resolutely supporting the USSR Supreme Soviet Appeal to the Parliaments and Peoples of the World and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's impassioned speech at the last USSR Supreme Soviet session, which accord with the hopes and aspirations of all the world's peace-loving forces.

The Mongolian people have arrived at their glorious 60th anniversary full of strength and optimism. Nationwide labor competition is expanding. This is evidence of the people's unanimous support for the party's domestic and foreign policy. In the struggle to build a new life, the Mongolian people have marched and will continue steadfastly to march side by side with the peoples of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community, together with all present-day revolutionary and progressive forces.

MONGOLIA'S TSEDENBAL ARRIVES IN USSR ON VACATION

LD261330 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 25 Jul 81

[Text] On the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, Tsedenbal, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic, arrived today in the Soviet Union on vacation.

U.S. 'PRESSURE' INCREASES JAPAN'S MILITARY EFFORT

PM241213 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed article under the rubric "Notes Apropos": "Yielding to Pressure": from the "World Today" feature compiled by S. Chugrov]

[Text] As KYODO has reported, during a luncheon at his residence with leaders of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, Michael Mansfield, American ambassador in Tokyo, urged them to increase the country's military spending by no less than 7.5 percent a year.

Washington is known to be trying to get Tokyo to double military appropriations. The United States is also demanding that the Japanese navy and air force be ready to conduct combat operations practically throughout the northwest Pacific.

Demanding, demanding, demanding.... There is no end to the stream of demands pouring from the other side of the ocean. Here the American administration does not stop at crude pressure. Quite recently official Tokyo tried to maneuver, citing financial difficulties and the masses' growing antiwar sentiments. But Japanese commentators point out that Japan's evasive stance was dictated merely by the desire to "save face" before the gross encroachment on the part of the United States, which is demanding, to use the expression of the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN, "too much too quickly."

However, the undisguised pressure proved effective. The newspaper YOMIURI has been forced to admit that, during the Japanese-American summit meeting scheduled for 21 July within the framework of the conference of the "seven" in Ottawa, Prime Minister Z. Suzuki intends to announce Japan's agreement to "make the maximum effort to increase its defense strength, paying special attention to the navy and air force." This came to light at a session of the Cabinet of Ministers on the results of the U.S. trip of J. Omura, chief of Japan's Defense Agency.

Does this mean that the Japanese authorities have coped with the financial difficulties? Or that the country's public has changed its views? By no means: It is simply that the Tokyo politicians have evidently felt the spurs and are willing to whip up the already galloping military expenditure.

AFP CITED ON CIA'S ACTIVITIES IN AFGHANISTAN

LD251122 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 25 Jul 81

[Text] Paris, 25 Jul, TASS--The Central Intelligence Agency of the United States organized and coordinated the delivery of weapons to Afghan terrorist gangs sent into Afghanistan from neighbouring Pakistan, a Washington correspondent of FRANCE PRESSE was informed by the sources close to the Pentagon.

According to information made available to FRANCE PRESSE says that China, Egypt, Pakistan and some other countries are taking part in that undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Weapons deliveries are primarily financed by the United States, while one of the main arms suppliers is Egypt. Pakistan has been turned into a trans-shipment point through which weapons are flowing across the Afghan frontier. Apart from that, the production of large quantities of weapons for Afghan terrorist gangs has been started in Pakistan. It is noted that the CIA modelled that programme following the pattern of weapons deliveries to right-wing groupings in Laos during the U.S. aggression against Vietnam.

Still recently the CIA carried out such operations in tight secrecy. However, it is clear from a FRANCE PRESSE dispatch that after President Reagan and Secretary of Defence Weinberger publicly had voiced readiness to supply aid to Afghan terrorists openly, there was no longer any need for camouflage. Hence, the revelations of the Pentagon sources.

Enthusiastically responding to Washington's proposal, two ring-leaders of Afghan counter-revolutionary gangs arrived in Washington recently with the new "orders." The trip of the terrorists to the United States and the welcome accorded to them are regarded to prove that the Washington administration is going to scale up the undeclared war against Afghanistan.

BAKHTAR ATTACK ON U.S.-PAKISTANI TIES NOTED

PM241040 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 81 p 4

[TASS report: "Condemnation of Militarist Policy: BAKHTAR Commentary"]

[Text] Kabul, 19 Jul--BAKHTAR has issued a resolute condemnation of the militarist policy being implemented by Pakistan's ruling circles with the support of American imperialism. Commenting on the visit by Agha Shahi, Pakistani foreign minister, to the United States, and also the American administration's decision to give Islamabad $3 billion worth of military aid, BAKHTAR notes that military cooperation between Islamabad and Washington is a major obstacle in the path of a settlement of the Afghanistan situation. Deliveries of weapons to Pakistan, the agency stresses, in no way promote the preservation of peace and security in the region, but on the contrary, the Pakistani regime is being transformed, in U.S. hands, into a hostile instrument against the DRA.

The Afghan side has declared clearly and precisely to Pakistan its readiness to begin talks without delay on th elaboration of an agreement on normalizing relations. However, under pressure from the Reagan administration Ziaul Haq's regime is evading talks.

BAKHTAR notes also that the American administration is seeking a so-called "settlement" of the region's problems by means of the militarization of Pakistan and interference in other countries' internal affairs. As for the DRA, it has chosen the path to a settlement which is set out in the DRA Government statement of 14 May 1980, which provides for equal, free, bilateral talks, BAKHTAR stresses in conclusion.

ARTAMONOV REVIEWS AID TO BURMA, CURRENT RELATIONS

FM241036 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent A. Artamonov dispatch: "On the Path of Progress"]

[Text] Rangoon--The columns of the technological institute in Burma's capital Rangoon shine white. Its corridors are alive. Youths and girls fill all three floors of the institute; they are standing around in small groups and discussing something excitedly. The examinations are in progress. The latest replenishment is joining the ranks of the national cadres.

The technological institute, where about 4,000 people study at present, was erected and equipped by the Soviet Union, and 20 years ago, on 15 July 1961, it was donated to the Burmese people with other installations also created with the USSR's assistance.

Soviet-Burmese cooperation was born in the mid-fifties. This was the period when the young state, which had embarked on the path of political independence both within the country and on the international arena, was beset with serious economic adversities. Burma, regarded as the rice granary of Southeast Asia, had accumulated great rice reserves which could not be sold on the foreign market as a result of U.S. economic actions which undermined the potential of Burmese exports. Under these circumstances the Soviet Union purchased major consignments of rice in Burma.

Soviet-Burmese coopeation has developed in different spheres--in the sphere of irrigation and cotton growing, in compiling soil maps, in the sphere of industry and in training national cadres. In recent years the volume of cooperation has declined, although there are no objective reasons which might hinder its further development. In this connection the following opinion may be heard in Burma: As distinct from the help received from the major capitalist countries and international organizations in which Western capital is king, nowhere has cooperation with the socialist community states ever led to troubles in the economy of the liberated countries. It is invariably of a mutually advantageous nature and takes account primarily of the genuine interests of the developing countries.

The Burmese people appraised highly the results of the initial period of Soviet-Burmese cooperation. "Relations between the Soviet Union and Burma are developing on the basis of the principles of mutual respect and mutual advantage," President U Ne Win noted in 1971. "Taking this mutual understanding into consideration, we are convinced that there is a firm basis for strengthening our bilateral relations."

The years pass, but the importance of the installations donated by the Soviet Union to Burma does not diminish. The technological institute remains the largest educational establishment of this type in the whole of Southeast Asia. Here they recall with kind words the Soviet teachers who trained the Burmese for many years. They also recall with warmth the Soviet doctors working at another installation also donated to Burma--the Sao San Htun [Hospital] in Taunggyi City. This hospital, which is the largest in upper Burma, is still working successfully today.

The Soviet peoples follow with great interest and respect the socioeconomic development of Burma and are sincerely glad at the Burmese people's successes on the path of progress. It is with great satisfaction that Soviet people welcome the fact that the foundation for the development of comprehensive Soviet-Burmese ties has been laid and that every opportunity exists for their further consolidation.

HUNGARY'S KADAR ARRIVES IN USSR FOR HOLIDAY

LD261518 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 26 Jul 81

[Text] Comrade Janos Kadar, first secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee, arrived in the Soviet Union today for a short holiday. He is here at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

SOVIET, CSSR TRADE MINISTERS DISCUSS COOPERATION

PM231249 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general headline "Ties Expanding"]

[Text] On 14 July N.S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, had talks with B. Urban, CSSR minister of foreign trade.

Questions of the further development of trade and economic relations between the USSR and the CSSR were discussed.

SUPREME SOVIET DELEGATION LEAVES FOR GDR

LD270820 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 27 Jul 81

[Text] A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet left Moscow today for an official friendly visit to Berlin at the invitation of the GDR People's Chamber. The delegation is headed by Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy of the Supreme Soviet. The delegation includes USSR Supreme Soviet delegates Akimov, Aksenov, Blokhina, Sologub and Tarasov.

YUGOSLAVIA SUPPORTS SUPREME SOVIET APPEAL

PM221406 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jul 81 p 4

[TASS report under the general headline: "Inspiring Appeal"]

[Text] Belgrade, 15 Jul--Yugoslavia supports the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal "To the World's Parliaments and Peoples," a report on a session of the SFRY Federal Assembly Federal Executive Council Foreign Affairs Commission published here states.

This constructive new initiative, the report stresses, is aimed at easing international tension and resolving all major international problems like the problem of disarmament and crisis hotbeds through negotiations. All states, and primarily the great powers, bear responsibility for turning the detente process into the main trend of international development. There is no other sensible alternative.

The great powers, the session noted, must initiate talks as soon as possible on the problem of the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and other questions of limiting the arms race. These talks must lead to a reduction of tension in the military sphere.

CPSU DELEGATION DEPARTS FOR PCE CONGRESS

LD262228 Moscow TASS in English 2155 GMT 26 Jul 81

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jul, TASS--A CPSU delegation, including alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy of the Chief Editor of the newspaper PRAVDA Yu. A. Sklyarov (head of the delegation), leader of the group of consultants of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee Yu. A. Zhilin, and high-ranking official of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus V.V. Pertsov, has left today for Madrid at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain (PCE) to take part in the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of Spain.

PATOLICHEV MEETS WITH FRENCH, ITALIAN OFFICIALS

Meeting With French Minister

PM241043 Moscow Izvestiya in Russian 17 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talk Held"]

[Text] N.S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, received 14 July M. Freyche, head of the department of Foreign Economic Relations of the French Ministry of Economy and Finances.

A talk was held on questions of the development of trade and economic relations between the two countries.

H. Froment-Meurice, French ambassador to the USSR, was present at the talk.

Talks on Trade With Italy

PM241238 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jul 81 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general headline "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 16 July USSR Foreign Trade Minister N.S. Patolichev received M. Schimberni, president of the Italian Montedison concern. Talks were held on questions of expanding Soviet foreign trade organizations' business ties with this concern.

PRAVDA COMMENTS ON WESTERN PROPOSALS FOR CYPRUS

PM241627 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 81 p 5

[PRAVDA correspondent N. Miroshnik dispatch: "Unsound Plans: How the West is Tackling the Cyprus Question"]

[Text] Nicosia, July--"The first bell" was sounded back in mid-March. At a time when the intercommunity talks, the latest round of which began in the Cypriot capital last fall, were, by common consent, still at a standstill and could scarcely have been said to have made rapid progress, an interview by Greek Foreign Minister K. Mitsotakis in the French newspaper LE MONDE came like a bolt from the blue.

To Cypriots' surprise, the minister expressed optimism concerning an early solution of the Cyprus problem, to which "certain signs" were pointing. A short time passed and following a meeting with his U.S. and Turkish colleagues during the NATO conference in Rome, K. Mitsotakis expressed even greater confidence.

The press set about elucidating the diplomatic innuendos. The London-based newspaper THE SUNDAY TIMES published an article stating that the United States and Britain, with Greece and Turkey and in collaboration with the United Nations, had devised a new settlement plan which had supposedly already been discussed by representatives of both of the island's communities and would be officially submitted by the UN secretary general after the elections in the Turkish community at the end of June. The ball was kept rolling by Turkey's TERCUMAN, which virtually repeated THE SUNDAY TIMES report, citing British Foreign Office sources.

All these articles and subsequent "elaborations" by other foreign newspapers evoked a lively reaction in Cyprus. Despite denials from spokesmen for the Cyprus Government and the United Nations and from the leaders of the Turkish community that they knew anything about the plan's existence, local observers agreed that the article in THE SUNDAY TIMES was not simply a phony sensation or a provocative rumor. Most probably, they felt, it was a trial baloon sent up in order to sound out the reaction in Cyprus and abroad to the West's new "initiative."

New rumors prompted an unexpected secret visit to Cyprus by J. Bullard, British deputy under secretary of state for foreign affairs, which the public only learned of when it was virtually over. The local APOGEVMATINI openly wrote that the Greek-Cypriot side is being subjected to real pressure to make concessions on questions relating to the future of Cyprus's state system.

Despite failing to solve the Cyprus question to their advantage by "surgical" means, that is through the coup and the foreign military intervention provoked by them in the summer of 1974, the Western strategists have lost none of their zeal, especially as recently, following the U.S. loss of its Iranian outposts and in connection with its elaboration of a new aggressive strategy for the Near and Middle East, the importance of Cyprus as a possible bridgehead has still further increased. The stick has been replaced by a carrot and the Atlanticists are now insistently proffering their services to solve "by peaceful means" the problem which they themselves created. By ignoring the proposals backed by the government and people of Cyprus for the convening of a representative international conference under UN auspices to examine the foreign policy aspects of the Cyprus problem and "stalling" from behind the scenes intercommunity talks on its internal aspects, NATO's bosses want to solve the question "in the family" to their own best advantage.

Judging from the article in THE SUNDAY TIMES, the new proposals by the United States and its allies envisage returning to the Greek-Cypriot part of the territory occupied in 1974 and giving the considerable number of refugees an opportunity to return to their native parts. But in exchange for this the Greek-Cypriot side will, in fact, have to give up the idea of preserving a single federal state. The Western plan envisages creating a sort of loose confederation with two virtually autonomous zones. That is, instead of a single, territorially intact Cyprus they would like to establish two state structures only nominally held together by common bonds.

Admittedly, the plan's authors have tried to get away from the concept of a "confederation" by, according to press reports, coining the term "quasifederation," hitherto unknown in constitutional law. With the help of such linguistic disquisitions they also plan to "solve" the problem of the presence of foreign troops on the island: They are to remain but will be renamed "NATO troops." To add weight to this, NATO will actually be given an opportunity to create a military base in northern Cyprus. But as on other occasions the north Atlantic bloc will give its name to this merely as camouflage since the base will in fact be used by the United States as a stronghold for its Rapid Deployment Force.

Judging from press commentaries the plan as published satisfies all its authors. The benefits for the United States and its allies are obvious.

But the legitimate question arises: Do Cypriots themselves need the West's latest "offering"? What benefits will the implementation of such a plan bring Cyprus? All the signs are that the plan's authors were not much interested in this. Yet they should have been since, as the recent parliamentary elections held on the island showed, the overwhelming majority of the republic's population supports the political forces advocating a free and independent Cyprus.

RESULTS OF IRANIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS REPORTED

LD270740 Moscow TASS in English 0730 GMT 27 Jul 81

[Text] Tehran, 27 Jul, TASS--Although the returns in the presidential elections in Iran of July 24 are still being counted, the victory of Prime Minister Mohammad 'Ali Raja'i has already become an obvious fact. According to preliminary results broadcast by Tehran Radio, he has already polled more than 12.5 million votes.

PARS news agency reports that in the parliamentary by-elections, which were held simultaneously with the presidential elections, candidates from Iran's ruling Islamic Republican Party have been elected members of parliament in the majority of constituencies.

Moscow Persian Report

GF251150 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 24 Jul 81

[Text] The presidential election and Islamic Majlis byelection will be held in Iran today. The election is taking place under a complicated situation. Antigovernment minigroups are engaged in an intimidation campaign to abort the election. On the eve of the election, one deputy was wounded and another was killed.

KUVALDIN COMMENTS ON 'ARAFAT PRESS CONFERENCE

LD262250 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 26 Jul 81

[By TASS news analyst Georgiy Kuvaldin]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jul, TASS--"Attainment of a just and lasting peace, security and stability in the Middle East is impossible without restoring the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to national self-determination and establishment of its own independent state,"said at a press-conference in Beirut Chairman of the PLO Executive Committee Yasir 'Arafat. He stressed that the large-scale aggression unleashed by the Government of Israel with the support of the United States against Lebanon was aimed at a physical annihilation of the Palestine Resistance Movement.

The statement of the Palestinian leader is yet another reminder of the fact that the basis of Washington's Middle East policy is, like before, the anti-Palestinian thrust, ignoring the Palestinian factor as an inalienable element in any Middle East settlement. The United States of America, not wishing to take account of realities, stubbornly sticks to this dyed-in-the wool position rejecting any contacts with the PLO, although that organization, which is the sole lawful representative for the Arab people of Palestine, has gained broad international recognition, has the status of observer with the United Nations, and missions in scores of countries.

Following a clearly discriminatory course, the United States, as was stated by U.S. television, will not consent to direct contacts with the PLO until the latter "recognizes the right of Israel to existence and agrees to the UN resolutions on the Arab-Israeli conflict." It is characteristic that submitting such demands to the PLO, Washington at the same time, demands nothing of Israel and encourages its policy of genocide against the Palestinian people, its desire for territorial expansion and settlement in the occupied Arab and Palestinian lands.

Washington's anti-Arab course is one of the chief causes of the dangerous tensions that have long troubled the Middle East. To exert pressure on the Palestinians and the Arab countries, the United States resorts both to military means, supplying the Israeli aggressors with the most sophisticated weapons and broadening its military presence in the region, and to political pressure exerted by American emissaries.

It is not fortuitous that Washington regards the ceasefire in Lebanon as a handy opportunity for a rapid resumption of the supplies to Israel of F-16 fighter-bombers and speaks of "broadening" the mission of Philip Habib, the special envoy of the U.S. President in the Middle East, who this time will probably step up pressure on Syria.

Neither have there been any changes so far in the expansionist aspirations of Israel, which, relying on the comprehensive support and patronage of the United States, not only fails to discontinue its aggressive acts against its Arab neighbours but is constantly expanding the scale of its attacks. In the process, Tel Aviv grossly violates the elementary norms of international law, ignores and tramples underfoot resolutions adopted by the United Nations. A favourable situation for the conduct of such a course has been created by the Camp David Accords and by the position of betrayal adopted with regard to the general Arab struggle against the Israeli aggression by the regime of the Egyptian President as-Sadat.

The Arab press voices the opinion that the ceasefire achieved in South Lebanon in line with the relevant UN Security Council resolution will most likely be used by the Israeli military for preparing new aggressive actions against the Lebanese and the Palestinian peoples. Reports coming from Israel seem to bear this out. In Israel, writes, among others, the correspondent of the American NBC television company in Tel Aviv, there exists the opinion that a ceasefire will not last long and that hostilities will be resumed.

NEDELYA SEES U.S. QUEST FOR MIDEAST 'DIKTAT'

PM240900 Moscow NEDELYA no 29 Signed to Press 16 Jul 81 p 16

[Leonid Koryavin article: "Behind a Smokescreen"]

[Excerpt] It is well known that back under President Carter a doctrine about "use of military force" in the Persian Gulf "under special circumstances" was proclaimed. The latter thesis was deliberately dramatized by the Americans. They began with the help of propaganda institutes to paint a dark picture of the future which awaits the Near East. And they laid it on thick in order to reflect the imaginary "Soviet Invasion" which they claim is bound to occur in the region, which the United States is called on to "save" and "secure." This was deliberate falsification, the smokescreen behind which Washington hid the armor of its dreadnoughts.

The new Washington administration has taken up where the old one left off. It has not only made the doctrine part of its own armory but has actively begun to bolster it. The main offspring of the doctrine--the so-called Rapid Deployment Force [RDF]--has been the object of special concern under the new President. "Reagan's approach," the magazine JOURNAL OF COMMERCE says, "is much broader and consequently requires much greater funds. The President has added almost $2.5 billion to the already considerable sum demanded by President CArter for 1982 to cover expenses connected with the RDF."

The facts show that the United States is striving to establish its military ditkar over the Near and Middle East. It is well known that the Persian Gulf contains 46 percent of all located oil reserves in the capitalist world and supplies over 60 pecent of all the "liquid gold" imported by the West. Imperialist monopolies, operating in close liaison with the Pentagon, are hatching plans to restore their former dominance over the Near East oil klondikes. The Persian Gulf is not only full of American ships, but is also virtually hemmed in on both sides by the big U.S. naval formations deployed in the Mediterranean Sea and the Indian Ocean.

The United States is surrounding the oil-producing countries with a chain of military bases, which Washington has long been planning to create. The accelerated building of foreign military installations by the United States has increased international tension and has been a serious threat both for the developing countries and for the international situation as a whole.

And it is clear that the concentration of American forces in the Persian Gulf is a reaction by Washington to the revolutionary transformations in Iran and to other national liberation processes going on in the region.

Now much is being written about a so-called "peace-keeping force for Sinai" to be introduced there after the proposed withdrawal of Israeli troops in accordance with the Camp David agreement. This is yet another Washington smokepot behind which it is trying to hide its military preparations in the Near East. The magazine JOURNAL OF COMMERCE says bluntly: "The United States is trying to use the Sinai peace-keeping force as a pretext to bring American troops into the region."

The United States is today deliberately turning Egypt into its military test ground. It is not content merely with creating military bases there--for instance in Ras Banas, where it is planned to concentrate the Rapid Deployment Force. Pentagon strategists would like to deploy large troop formations on Egyptian territory in order to send them to any point in the Near or Middle East and also on the African Continent where it might be necessary to suppress national liberation movements and uphold the American military diktat.

Recently military maneuvers codenamed "Bright Star" were held in Egypt. This was virtually the jumping-off point for the American military, who are elaborating "combat tactics in desert conditions" or, to put it more simply, are preparing to seize other people's oil sources. The American military presence in Egypt is also emphasized by the fact that there are already U.S. Air Force squadrons there whose pilots today patrol above the ancient sphinx and pyramids.

But in the Near East the United States is still gambling chiefly on Israel, which continues to implement its expansionist course in relation to the Arab states. The Tel Aviv military are continuing their military actions in south Lebanon and are threatening the Syrian troops in that country as representatives of the peace-keeping forces. The latest barbarous act by Israel--the bombing of the peaceful nuclear reactor near Baghdad--is evidence that the United States is encouraging Tel Aviv to carry out the most dangerous adventures.

It is obvious that Israel could not have carried out such blatant military actions if it had not felt constant support from the United States. The Washington POST cites these figures: In the last 4 years the United States has given Israel over $11 billion in aid. The annual subsidy to Israel amounts to over $2 billion and this is equivalent, according to experts, to over $3,500 a year for every Israeli family of five. But the paradox is that this American money, or more accurately the money of the American taxpayer, never reaches the Israeli family. It is totally swallowed up by the Israeli military-industrial complex, where modern fighter-bombers, tanks, electronic equipment and a whole arsenal of other arms are now being created.

It is no accident that one journalist graphically noted: "The burden of military spending has broken the back of the Israeli economy." But Tel Aviv, despite all this, continues to urge on its militarist chariot and to march in its soldier's boots down the thorny path of military adventures.

The situation in the Near East today is disturbing. The pages of the world press are full of military communiques from this region and the smoke from the ruins of the south Lebanese cities and villages drifts, as it were, across the pages of the papers. And when people read reports from the Near East in the newspapers, listen to the news broadcast on the radio from there and see on their TV screens fragments of the events taking place there, with profound alarm they associate all this with the concepts of "death," "destruction" and "violence."

Time has already bought a verdict of guilty on the chief party responsible for the Near East crisis--the Israeli state. The United States of America, which actively supports Tel Aviv's expansionist course, also stands accused.

Neither Tel Aviv nor its patrons can hide their crimes behind a smokescreen of lies and misinformation. The peoples are vigilantly watching their intrigues and are demanding a rapid solution of the complex Near East crisis.

U.S. POLICY CALLED 'TWO FACED, HYPOCRITICAL, CYNICAL'

TA250614 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1800 GMT 23 Jul 81

[Text] The world public is expressing dissatisfaction and anger over Israel's aggressive actions in Lebanon. The press in every country is pointing out that, in order to prevent the danger of a military conflagration in the Middle East, the gravest international sanctions the UN code provides for must be immediately applied against Israel. However, the ruling circles in Israel are not afraid of international sanctions. They feel confident under the aegis of the United States. But can the United States be relied upon? Is its policy constant or consistent?

The United States is using Israel as a tool; it encourages Begin in all kinds of adventures against the neighboring countries and supports these adventures. However, is Washington not looking for ways to infiltrate Arab countries? Is it not trying to guarantee its own interests in the Middle East by sending weapons to Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries which do not conceal their hostility toward Israel? The U.S. policy may be explained by the fact that Washington, in its Middle East Policy, does not intend to put its bets on only one side. Furthermore, if we make a deeper examination, Washington, even now, is giving Riyadh preference over Israel. After all, it is a fact that the weapons dispatches to Saudi Arabia are more valuable than the arms dispatches to Israel.

Saudi oil and petrodollars are more important for the U.S. monopolies which determine U.S. policy than anything else; In any event, more important than Israeli diamonds and citrus fruit. The French paper LE MONDE writes, according to the official statistics, EXXON and Mobil Oil have taken the first place in the rate of profits among 500 U.S. companies. EXXON's profits, for example, totalled far more than $100 billion and these profits are, to a great extent, being made by the oil concerns thanks to their manipulation with Saudi oil. The billions of Saudi petrodollars invested in U.S. banks are very important for the United States. NEWSWEEK points out that without the petrodollars, the U.S. financial establishment cannot exist. And this is why the ruling circles in the United States, who are offering their support to Israeli policy, are closely connected with Saudi Arabia. And this is the reason that its Middle East policy is a hypocritical, two-faced and cynical one.

There are people who are calming the Israelis and persuading them that the dispatch of U.S. arms to Egypt are not dangerous to Israel, since Egypt is, as it were, linked with the Camp David agreements. But can we take As-Sadat's policy seriously? Is he any more nor less than a temporary personality, toward whom many people in Egypt have an attitude of hostility and hatred or regard him as a betrayer of pan-Arabism and the ideas of the Egyptian revolution? Well, the United States, which looks after its selfish interests, is increasing its arms supplies to both sides in the Middle East. The question arises, as a result, of what will happed to Israel, which is fully dependent on the United States, if Washington decides that the U.S. interests in the Middle East can be more easily guaranteed, and it would be more worthwhile to do so, not through Israel, but through other means, and it may be that this is even at Israel's expense.

ISRAELI THREATS FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE NOTED

LD252230 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 25 Jul 81

[Text] Beirut, 25 Jul TASS--The Israeli hawks, notwithstanding the ceasefire which has entered into force in Lebanon in accordance with the U.S. Security Council's resolution, are again coming out with impudent threats to sovereign Lebanon and the Palestinian Resistance Movement.

Israeli Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir has stated that he is skeptical about the duration of the present ceasefire. According to General Eytan, chief of the General Staff of the Israeli Armed Forces, the Israeli Army is prepared at any moment to take "still more draconian measures with regard to Lebanon". Mordekhay Tzipori, Israeli deputy defence minister, has frankly stated that a moment will soon come when Israel will try to solve the question of the Palestinian Resistance Movement in Lebanon "once and for all".

The joint U.S.-Israeli plan for a "settlement" on the Lebanese crisis, plan in which one of the main roles is assigned to Philip Habib, U.S. President's special envoy in the Middle East,envisages the elimination of the Palestinian Resistance Movement, the defeat of the National Patriotic Forces of Lebanon, and the transfer of power in the country to Tel Aviv agents. The rightist-Christian forces are such, this was stated in an interview with the Lebanese weekly AL-HURRIYAH by Nayif Hawatimah, general secretary of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

He urged the Arab states to give an effective all-round assistance to the Palestinian revolution and the Lebanese national-patriotic forces in their struggle against the Israeli military and United States which has armed Israel with most up-to-date weapons.

SOVIET DIPLOMAT WARNS ISRAEL ON ACTION IN LEBANON

TA240705 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 24 Jul 81 pp 1, 2

[Report by U.S. correspondent Gid'on Samet]

[Text] Washington, 23 Jul (special for HA'ARETZ)--"The present situation in the Middle East may lead to a catastrophe that may involve the Soviet Union, the United States and Europe. If a military confrontation in the Middle East develops the result cannot be foreseen." This was said to the HA'ARETZ correspondent by a Soviet diplomat in Washington. The diplomat,who is well versed in Middle East issues,said this on Wednesday [22 July] in a talk whose contents had apparently been approved for publication in advance by the Soviet Embassy.

It is the first time in a long while that a Soviet representative has made remarks intended for publication in the Israeli communications media.

"Not all parties understand the gravity of the situation," the diplomat who asked that his name be not publicized said. "It does not seem that Mr Begin is aware of the gravity of the situation he is creating. His deeds are the major reason for what is happening. He is talking of coexistence, of the right of Arabs and Jews to live together, but from a historic perspective he himself is preparing a catastrophe for Israel."

The diplomat made it clear that his reference is to the long-term results of the Israel-Arab conflict which, in his opinion, will extremely undermine Israel's security. Nevertheless his reference to the possible results of the "present situation" was put in more immediate terms.

The Soviet representative handed the HA'ARETZ correspondent the version of the sharp reaction the TASS news agency released on 21 July following the bomings in Lebanon and requested that it be attached to his observations. In his remarks the Soviet diplomat did not reiterate the expressions used in the TASS announcement.

The diplomat assessed that "the coming period is a tinder box."

Addressing himself to the issue of Syrian missiles in Lebanon the Soviet diplomat said in answer to a question: "Anything may happen. I cannot exlude anything due to Begin's policy. I am wary of those predictions that Begin will calm down after he produces sufficient escalation."

In answer to a question about possible Israeli action against the missiles in Lebanon the diplomat said: "I would warn Israel against such an action. The Israeli operations were the ones that caused Syria to station the defensive missiles in Lebanon. It would be a very dangerous step by Israel to embark on a military operation on this issue. Whoever makes such a decision will not end the reason for the appearance of the missiles. The problem will not be solved thus."

The Soviet diplomat however said that the Soviet Union does not want "to be apparent and visible" in the Middle East and does not mean to take advantage of "ephemeral tactical circumstances" like the United States.

"There is a tendency in Israel to play down the role that the Soviet Union is playing in the Middle East as a preventive and curbing element. We are trying to put limits on the actions of Arab countries with an extreme approach," the diplomat added.

"Our policy is stable and unchanging. This is also why, despite the developments in the Middle East in the last decade, our position has basically remained unchanged. The Soviet Union is prepared to undertake any task and to participate in any guarantee for the safeguarding of a practical and lasting peace between Israel and its neighbors as well as to safeguard Israel's peace."

The Soviet diplomat emphasized: "All those who want to hold discussions with us can find the way. The attempt to dismiss the Soviet role in the Middle East has in fact failed. Without the Soviet Union it is impossible to reach a solution in the region."

According to him the Soviet initiative does not have any chance of getting started at this stage since it is known it will be repudiated by Israel and the United States outright. Begin and the Israeli politicians who are close to him have a different approach--an approach of aggression, militarism and reliance on force. However, the use of force will not bring about a solution but a catastrophe that may involve the Soviet Union, the United States and Europe. If there is a military confrontation in the Middle East it is impossible to foresee the outcome.

The Soviet diplomat refused to give details about his country's attitude toward Syria and their bilateral relations or to answer a question whether an Israeli military operation against the missiles may activate a clause on aid in the two countries' friendship agreement.

"I will not elaborate on Syria. Anything may happen," he said. He explained that motives for the Soviet-Syrian maneuver as an expression of the Soviet Union's legitimate interest in the Mediterranean and as a natural development of the relations with the Syrians. He termed as "interesting" the prevalent assumption that it was also a demonstration of force toward the U.S. administration and U.S. tendencies in the region. He refused to answer the question whether the maneuver was, among other things, a warning against an Israeli operation directed at the missiles.

The talk with the Soviet diplomat lasted for about 90 minutes.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE REVIEWS BREZHNEV BOOK

PM241410 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 81 pp 2-3

[Editorial article: "In the Name of Peaceful Creation: On the Publication of Volume 8 of L.I. Brezhnev's Works 'Following Lenin's Course'"]

[Text] This is the seventh decade that our great people have been marching confidently and firmly toward new heights of economic, social and cultural progress, following the difficult, unknown and unbeaten path to a communist future. What is the reason for the outstanding successes and victories? What gives Soviet people the strength to surmount any difficulties on this path? It is, above all, the Leninist party's true, principled, profoundly scientific policy, the working people's boundless trust in it and undivided support for it, and the unbreakable unity of the party and the people.

The Communist Party itself is flesh of the people's flesh, uniting progressive, conscious, disciplined representatives of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the people's intelligentsia. This is convincingly evidenced by biographies of leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state. Leonid Ilich Brezhnev embarked on his working life 60 years ago and has been working indefatigably ever since. It will soon be 50 years since the party admitted to its ranks a devoted, active Leninist communist who spares no effort for the common cause and who has now become its acknowledged leader, an outstanding figure in the world communist and workers movement and one of the leading politicians of our age.

Constant closeness to working people, respect for and attention to them, the ability to understand, scientifically express, embody in political decisions and tirelessly realize the vital interests of the working masses--this is a characteristic feature of leaders of the Leninist type. This feature, inherent in the entire multifaceted activity of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, is clearly reflected in the entire contents of his new book, published recently by the Political Literature Publishing House. The materials included in the eighth volume of speeches, greetings messages and articles--"Following Lenin's Course"--cover an important and complex period saturated with events--from April 1979 through March 1981, including the time of the preparation and holding of the 26th CPSU Congress--and convincingly show L.I. Brezhnev's tremendous personal contribution to party policy, to our country's movement along the path of communist building and to the great cause of the struggle for lasting peace and social progress on earth.

1.

The most acute, urgent and crucial task of our time, as L.I. Brezhnev points out in his works, is the preservation of peace, the consolidation of the relaxation of international tension, the ending of the senseless, wasteful arms race and the prevention of a new world war. "We Soviet people," L.I. Brezhnev said at the recent USSR Supreme Soviet session which adopted the appeal "To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World," "are especially acutely aware of the measure of this responsibility. We have behind us the terrible war experience of routing the German fascist aggressors." This historic experience, gained at a tremendous price, prompts us to redouble and triple our efforts in defense of peace, in which socialism--the society of peaceful creation--is, by its nature, vitally interested.

In the period under review the international situation became sharply exacerbated. The reasons for this were analyzed in depth by the 26th CPSU Congress and are revealed in a whole series of speeches by L.I. Brezhnev.

In the second half of the seventies capitalism entered a period of further crisis. Inflation is growing unchecked, and unemployment stands at an unprecedentedly high level. At the same time the working class and all working people are putting up increasingly stubborn resistance to the attemtps of the monopolies and bourgeois states to shift the entire burden of the crisis onto the shoulders of the working people: In 1980, even according to official figures, the number of strikers in developed countries reached 250 million. Imperialist circles are seeking a way out of the clutches of insoluble contradictions by exacerbating the international situation and in the arms race, hoping to change the existing correlation of forces in the world and to shift the course of history in their favor.

The report at the 26th CPSU Congress graphically described the antagonistic trends of the age and the increasingly sharp demarcation of the opposing forces in the world arena. "On the internatinal plane," L.I. Brezhnev pointed out, "the period under review was a complex and stormy time. It was marked, above all, by the intensive struggle of two trends in world politics. On the one hand, the policy of curbing the arms race, strengthening peace and detente and defending the peoples' sovereign rights and freedoms. On the other, the policy of undermining detente and escalating the arms race, the policy of threats and interference in other people's affairs, of suppressing the liberation struggle" (pp633-634). The more imperialism's potential for dominating others countries and peoples is curtailed, the more fiercely its most aggressive and shortsighted representatives react to this.

A decisive force in the struggle against imperialism and aggression is the community of socialist countries, their cohesion and unity of action and their consistent, peace-loving, internationalist policy--a policy of peaceful cooperation and equality in international relations, which enjoys the recognition and support of the world's peoples and of all champions of peace and social progress. The growing might and the strengthening unity of the socialist community have very clearly proved to be one of the chief factors in preventing war and suppressing the expansionist aspirations of imperialists and hegemonists. The practice of international life graphically attests to the beneficial influence of the activity of the defensive Warsaw Pact and of the peace initiatives of its member states on interstate relations and the political climate in Europe. "Now that the forces of imperialism have switched to a counteroffensive against detente, peace and the peoples' rights, the socialist countries' unity of action in defending these very great values is more important than ever" (p 281).

Our enemies understand this too. The imperialists, who, as the books points out, have learned to draw lessons from their defeats, are making increasingly violent attacks on the world of socialism, counting on the reanimation and growth of anti-socialist forces. Precisely this accounts for the unprecedented intensification of subversive activity against the new system in Poland. But the calculations of socialism's enemies, the author points out, are built on shaky foundations. "The history of world socialism," L.I. Brezhnev said in his report at the 26th CPSU Congress, "knows all sorts of trials. There have been both complex and crisis moments in it. But communists have always boldly met the enemy's attacks and won. This is how it has been and will be. And let no one doubt our common determination to safeguard our interests and defend the peoples' socialist gains."

The growing and constantly strengthening world communist movement possesses great potential for influencing the course of modern history. The anthology devotes considerable attention to problems of strengthening the unity of action of the world's communists in the struggle for the common cause, for the interests of the working class, for peace, freedom and the peoples' independence and for mankind's social progress. It is precisely in the international nature of this movement, the author points out, that mankind's hopes of peace and the triumph of the ideals of freedom, goodness and justice are to a decisive extent pinned.

At the same time the communist parties, L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, operate under different conditions and resolve dissimilar tasks, taking different approaches to resolving the problems facing them. "Our party proceeds from the premise that differences of opinion among communists are surmountable--if, of course, they are not fundamental differences between revolutionaries and reformists, between creative Marxism and dogmatic sectarianism and leftist adventurism. Here, of course, there can be no compromise--today, just as in Lenin's time. But when communists struggle for the common revolutionary cause, we proceed from the premise that patient comradely discussion of different views and positions best accords with their common aims" (p 651).

A prominent place in the book's pages is occupied by a comprehensive examination of questions of the modern national liberation movement and of relations with young developing states. These countries are very different, L. I. Brezhnev points out. After liberation from the colonial yoke some of them have taken a revolutionary-democratic path, while capitalist relations have become established in others. And there are countries which follow in the wake of imperialist policy. But by and large there is already definite confirmation of Lenin's brilliant prediction that "in the future decisive battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the earth's population, directed originally toward national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism..." ("Complete Collected Works" Vol 44 p 38).

Not only countries with a socialist orientation but also, for example, the Nonaligned Movement, which has become a great force, are socialism's natural ally in resolving many fundamental problems of the present day. The socialist community countries and young states come out increasingly frequently from identical or close positions in the struggle to strengthen peace, to create a new world economic order, against neocolonialism and the imperialist "gunboat policy" and in resolving other important questions of world politics. The Soviet Union's ties with such states are becoming increasingly intensive and close--which can be seen very well in the anthology's contents. This is very graphic evidence that the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state expresses the interests not only of the Soviet people but also of all working people and of the overwhelming majority of our world's population:

Advancing new peace initiatives and developing and further concretizing the peace program, which has won broad international recognition, our party and state are waging a consistent struggle for the bright future of all mankind. "Our struggle to strengthen peace and deepen the relaxation of international tension is, above all, a struggle to ensure that the Soviet people have the necessary external conditions to resolve the creative tasks facing them. In this way we are also resolving a problem of a truly worldwide nature. For there is now no issue more vital or more important for a single people than that of preserving peace and ensuring every person's paramount right--the right to life."

2.

L. I. Brezhnev's works contain an innovatory formulation of problems of the economic and social development of Soviet society. It is characterized by its profoundly thought-out, scientifically substantiated, critical and purposeful nature and by profound concern for the working people's good.

"It is precisely in the sphere of the economy that the foundation for resolving social tasks and strengthening the country's defense capability, the foundation of an active foreign policy is laid. It is right here that the necessary preconditions are created for the successful movement of Soviet society toward communism" (p 668). The book reflects the CPSU's tremendous theoretical, organizational and mass political activity aimed at improving our economic machinery, intensifying all social production and decisively enhancing the level of its management, further developing the socialist competition and increasing the people's labor activeness.

The USSR's economic development encountered considerable difficulties in the 10th 5-Year Plan. Analyzing their causes and indicating ways to overcome them, L.I. Brezhnev points out that, despite all these difficulties, the program for enhancing the Soviet people's well-being was, on the whole, fulfilled successfully. It is now a matter of creating conditions for yet greater progress in this direction, which is the highest goal of the CPSU's economic strategy. The level reached in the development of the country's national economy convinces us that now "...the enhancement of the people's well-being is inconceivable without increasing the efficiency of the economy and intensifying all social production" (p 471). Our party persistently places the elaboration and implementation of measures aimed at such a qualitative restructuring of many components of the economy at the center of attention not only of organs of state and economic management and production leaders but also of party, trade union and Komsomol organizations, labor collectives and all Soviet people. This is a truly nationwide matter.

At the CPSU Central Committee October (1980) Plenum L.I. Brezhnev drew attention to the need to make extensive use of the method of targeted programs, whereby "each such program must constitute a sound plan of measures based on accurate estimates and aimed at the end result, at the full resolution of a particular problem. It is important that the program define the stages and the sequence of the tasks to be resolved" (p 476). L.I. Brezhnev gave an example of such apportionment of the objects of targeted programing 1 year previous to that--at the CPSU Central Committee November (1979) Plenum. These were transportation, fuel and energy, metallurgy and machine building, capital construction and supplies of food and also industrial commodities to the population.

On this basis tasks were advanced for the decisive raising of the standard of management in the broadest sense of these words, including improving the use of scientific achievements and labor reserves as a consequence of this, increasing labor productivity, further strengthening discipline at all levels and in all work sectors and, finally, a more exacting approach to resolving cadre questions. It is necessary "more decisively...to replace those who fail to cope with the entrusted task and more boldly promote energetic, creatively thinking, enterprising comrades" (p 210). In the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th party congress this target designation assumed finished forms, and clear work directions were given to party committees and state and economic organs of all levels.

Putting the economy on a footing of intensive development presupposes, as the book points out, that the best end results must be achieved at the least cost, through more expedient use of the existing means and potential. Consequently, it is necessary to organize a persistent, daily, truly nationwide struggle for economy. In resolving this task economic problems proper combine directly with political-educational problems, with the need to further deepen democratic principles in the chief sphere of social life--in labor, in production--and with the need to make the maximum use of our quite irreplaceable reserve--the initiative of the masses.

Soviet society is a society of working people, and the tasks of its further progress are inseparably linked with the improvement of labor relations and of the system of material and moral labor incentives, with the improvement of working conditions and with the growth of labor productivity, as well as of attractiveness and creative principles in the labor process. The process of the increasingly active involvement of the broad masses of working people in production management, particularly by means of further developing socialist competition and introducing new forms of collective labor organization, possesses direct social and political substance and significance. "The party sees the socialist competition and the movement for a communist attitude to work not only as a powerful lever for augmenting labor successes and accelerating the resolution of large-scale economic tasks but also as a very important means of the masses' communist education. Competition exerts a beneficial influence on the moral atmosphere in collectives, on the fostering of the sense of being the country's master in Soviet people, on the development of socialist democracy and on all sociopolitical life" (p 10).

The party views economic tasks in close, organic interconnection with problems of social development and with political and ideological education tasks. This is precisely how the book formulates the tasks of improving socialist deomocracy, enhancing the economic role of soviets at all levels and of the state organs operating under their leadership and control, developing initiative and enhancing the social activeness of the broad working masses. The instructions of the 26th CPSU Congress on these issues are of fundamental, long-term significance. The book's author gives an example of an attentive, truly Leninist attitude toward initiative from below, the labor achievements and initiatives of workers and labor collectives in various sectors and toward the achievements of different components of our socialist collective of the whole people. This is evidenced by the anthology's numerous greetings messages to working people, which are imbued with concern for creating a creative atmosphere in society.

In the interconnected resolution on economic, social and political education tasks and in the course of the concrete, revolutionary transforming practice of communist building, the system of social relations of developed socialism is improved, and the social international and ideological-political unity of Soviet society is strengthened. "The cohesion and unity of society," L.I. Brezhnev says, "is socialism's unique asset and our priceless, invincible strength" (p 279). The development of these processes at this stage enabled the 26th party congress to draw the conclusion that already within the limits of the socialist phase it will be possible to overcome society's division into classes and advance along the road to a society of complete social homogeneity and actual social equality of all working people. Thus, while resolving urgent current tasks, the party always bears in mind the ultimate goals of our struggle and the communist perspective and does everything to ensure that the conscious, organized work and struggle of the people's masses for the sake of achieving these goals is increasingly active and effective.

3.

Making the people's good and the realization of the working people's vital interests its highest aim, the party of Lenin indefatigably improves the forms and methods of its activity among the masses, as well as its internal party life. This is the demand of the times. As our society advances, life sets the party and the people increasingly great and complex tasks, and the party's responsibility for their correct, efficient resolution becomes greater. In his report at the 26th CPSU Congress L.I. Brezhnev recalled: "The conclusion was drawn at the 25th congress that the party's role in the life of society increases in the period of developed socialism. The past 5 years have shown that that conclusion was undoubtedly correct. Right now, in the light of the Soviet people's impressive achievements, Lenin's well-known formula--The party is the mind, honor and conscience of our age--is perceived still more profoundly" (p 713).

The CPSU sacredly remembers and consistently implements the great behest of its founder and leader V.I. Lenin that "...THE ROLE OF A PROGRESSIVE FIGHTER CAN BE FULFILLED ONLY BY A PARTY GUIDED BY PROGRESSIVE THEORY" [capitalized passages published in boldface] (Vol 6 p 25). The creative development of Marxism-Leninism is constantly at the center of its attention. A substantial contribution to the treasure house of revolutionary theory was made by the elaboration of the concept of a developed socialist society, relying on which the party specified and concretized the ways and schedule for realizing our program aims and defined its strategy and tactics for a long historical period. All aspects of the CPSU's leading activity at the modern stage of our social development have firm scientific substantiation. Fidelity to creative Leninism and its revolutionary principles makes the party's work still more purposeful and effective and contributes to the still greater growth of its prestige and influence among the masses.

In the works of Volume 8 of the anthology "Following Lenin's Course," particularly in the precongress speeches and in the materials of the 26th CPSU Congress, questions of improving methods of party leadership of social development and internal party life, of improving the party's qualitative composition and enhancing the vanguard role of party organizations and communists are posed broadly and resolved multifacetedly and concretely. A truly Leninist approach manifests itself in the thesis, characteristic of the style of party activity, that "the party should never rest on its laurels and never believe that its prestige has been won once and for all. Therefore we seek to do more today than yesterday and to work with greater exertion of effort in the name of the people's good" (p 290).

The central task of party organizations is organization of mass political, ideological work associated with ensuring the decisive directions in the practice of communist building. Among the main directions of this work the book's author points to:

All possible development of socialist competition, its orientation toward qualitative indicators, the struggle for fulfillment of counterplans;

Support for and dissemination of progressive experience and progressive work forms and methods helping to increase labor productivity;

Consistent implementation of the policy of thrift, rational use of material and financial resources;

Struggle against violations of labor discipline, slovenliness and laxity. Labor collectives must play a growing role in this struggle (see p 211).

The party combines the clear practical thrust of mass political work with orientation toward communist ideals and with persistent enhancement of the political, moral and world outlook culture of the masses. It is in precisely this key area that the book views the tasks of improving ideological work and molding the new person--highly educated, cultured, possessing professional skill, and at the same time comprehensively developed, spiritually rich and able independently to interpret the most complex phenomena of modern life from positions of a scientific world outlook.

L.I. Brezhnev's works (particularly his report at the 26th CPSU Congress) provide a detailed program of the party's purposeful ideological and political educational activity, organically combining theory and practice, historical experience and urgent problems of the present day, spiritual values of general human significance and clear class ideological positions. This is precisely the formulation of questions of the education of youth, the molding of high political culture in all members of society, the tasks of literature, art, the mass propaganda and news media and so forth.

While creatively interpreting and generalizing experience of socialist and communist creation and important new phenomena and processes in the world arena, the CPSU indefatigably develops and enriches revolutionary theory. On this basis the directions for specifying program tasks were outlined in L.I. Brezhnev's report at the 26th party congress.

The contents of the anthology convincingly show that the Leninist Communist Party, which numbers 17.5 million fighters, is following the correct Leninist course and constantly strengthening its link with the people's masses, being their proven political leader and guide. It is tirelessly building up the ideological arsenal of Soviet society, strengthening the will of the masses and enhancing their initiative and energy. Therefore Soviet people look with confidence to tomorrow, "but their optimism is not the self-assurance of favorites of fortune. Our people know that everything they have has been created by their own labor and defended with their own blood, and we are optimistic because we believe in the power of labor, because we believe in our country and our people. We are optimists because we believe in our party and know that the path which it indicates is the only correct path!" (p 728).

L.I. Brezhnev's book gives a clear understanding of urgent problems of CPSU theory and policy and inspires confidence in the victory of the bright ideals of the world's communist transformation.

CSA'S GURYEV ISSUES STATEMENT ON 6-MONTH FIGURES

LD251415 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 24 Jul 81

[Statement by Central Statistical Administration (CSA) Deputy Director Vladimir Ilyich Guryev concerning the CSA report on fulfillment of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR during the first half of 1981--live or recorded]

[Excerpts] First I would like to mention that the tempo of industrial growth increased slightly in the second quarter in comparison with the beginning of the year. For the 6 month period the growth of industrial production increased by 3.4 percent. The plan for the general volume of production and the growth of productivity of labor was fulfilled. About four-fifths of the increase in production was due to increased productivity of labor. The plan established for the first half of the year was fulfilled by enterprises and associations of all all-union, union and republican ministries and departments with the exception of the Ministry of Timber, Paper and Pulp, and the Wood Processing Industry. A substantial complement to the plan was obtained in gas extraction, the production of mineral fertilizers, automation and computers, programmed machine tools, and tractors and other agricultural machinery. The half-yearly plan for output of many consumer and everyday goods was overfulfilled.

Overall, builders have been working fairly well. New enterprises have been built and existing ones modernized and expanded on a wide scale. This has enabled the production capacity of many types of products to be increased and the material-technical base of the economy to be strengthened. From state investments alone, about R31 billion in basic assets were commissioned. At the same time, there are shortcomings in the implementation of the building program. Funds have not been fully used in a number of places and delays are occurring in the building projects due to be commissioned.

In the first half of 1981 the average monthly wages of blue and white collar workers rose by 2.3 percent in comparison with the same period last year; the pay of collective farm workers rose by 4 percent. During the same period, the retail trade turnover increased significantly, as did the volume of services supplied to the population in both urban and rural areas. Almost R60 million were spent out of social consumer funds on the social needs of the population. About 540,000 apartments were commissioned from state and construction corporations' funds. In addition, a large number of apartments and houses were built by collective farms and by the population, both with their own funds and with the help of state credit. Many new schools, vocational and technical colleges, children's nurseries, hospitals and other amenities were commissioned. However the half-yearly plan for house and amenity building was not fulfilled.

As the USSR CSA report points out, a number of associations and undertakings and some branches of industry did not fulfill pledges in the production and marketing of their products, in the growth of productivity, or in reducing costs and stockpiles.

There were shortfalls in the output of finished rolled iron and steel, trucks and vans, industrial timber and a number of types of chemical products, textiles, refrigerators, sausages, animal fats and several products. The production associations and enterprises of a number of ministries, for example the oil refining, petrochemical, coal, iron and steel, heavy and transport engineering, vehicle, electro-technical and light industries--did not supply goods to consumers fully in accordance with agreements. I would also like to note that though there was an increase in the overall volume of trade turnover, the growing demand from the population for certain food and industrial products has not yet been fully satisfied.

ADMIRAL GORSHKOV CONGRATULATES MINESWEEPER CREW

PM241135 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jul 81 p 1

[Report by Capt V. Shirokov: "*Encouraged by Commander in Chief*"]

[Text] Red Banner Northern Fleet--The crew of the minesweeper under the command of Capt-Lt V. Kuznetsov is showing good results in combat and political training this training year. The socialist competition leader in the unit is fulfilling all the tasks set with "good" and "excellent" ratings.

The minesweeper was at the base when the order came in to go out into the Barents Sea as one of a group of ships and to perform a minesweeping operation in a set grid square. The crew of the excellent-rated ship performed the combat training task successfully. The minesweeping team under the command of Lt A. Timofeyev was hindered neither by the complex conditions nor by the "enemy's" resistance. The minesweeper's sailors acted precisely and harmoniously and exceeded the norms in all operations by 10 percent.

Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union S. Gorshkov, commander in chief of the navy and USSR deputy defense minister, who was visiting the Red Banner Northern Fleet, thanked the crew of the excellent-rated minesweeper.

PETROV ADDRESSES GROUND FORCES PARTY AKTIV

PM241129 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jul 81 p 2

[Report by Lt Col A. Sladkov: "Improving Style of Work"]

[Text] A meeting of the party aktiv of the Main Staff and directorates of the commander in chief of the Ground Forces has been held devoted to improving the style and methods of work, control and verification of execution in the light of the demands of the 26th CPSU Congress.

The report delivered by Col Gen M. Popkov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Ground Forces, and the speeches delivered by Comrades S. Aganov, Yu. Naumenko, O. Artemyev, G. Zakharov and others analyzed the party organizations' role in the struggle to further enhance the combat readiness of units and subunits and improve officers' command training and personnel's tactical and technical, special, mining and nightime training. A broad range of questions was examined connected with instilling efficiency, a high degree of discipline and creative activeness in the communists. It was noted that party organizations' activity has begun to display a more planned and purposeful nature and that efficiency has been enhanced in work to eliminate shortcomings, render aid locally, and introduce new, progressive methods of training and educating personnel.

Those taking part in the meeting were addressed by Army Gen V. Petrov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister.